

Mohammad Mohammad Isma'eel
Assistant Professor in the Egyptian University

Islamic Thought

Bismillah ir-Rahman ir-Raheem

Quest of Islamic culture (*thaqaafah islamiyyah*) is duty (fard) upon Muslims; whether quest of the legal texts (*musoos shar'eeah*) or the means (*wasaa'il*) that enable to understand and apply these texts. There is no difference between quest of legal rules (*ahkaam shar'eeah*) or Islamic thoughts (*afkaar*). It is, however sad that the Muslims turned away from the Islamic culture (*thaqaafah islamiyyah*) since the West invaded the Islamic countries with its culture and civilization (*Hadaarah*), and spread over them its laws, concepts and authority. This was due to the decline of the authority of Islam, and the deviation of the good task from its course, because of the misleading propaganda that waged its campaign against Islam and its culture.

I decided to publish some of this Islamic culture (*thaqaafah islamiyyah*), hoping that people, Muslims and non-Muslims, find in it that which educates their minds, correct their tastes and treats some of the intellectual decline (*huboot fikri*) that reigned this region.

I pray that Allah helps the Muslims to undertake what He obliged on them of the quest of Islam, conveying its da'wah and spreading its culture. Indeed He is All-Hearing (*Samee'*) and All-Complying (*Mujeeb*).

Mohammad Mohammad Ismaa'eel Abduh

Islam is a Specific Way of Living

Islam is a specific mode of living that is completely distinguished from everything else. It obliges upon Muslims a certain living that has a specific and constant course which does not change or transform. It dictates upon them to comply by this specific mode in a way that makes them **do not feel** with tranquillity, both intellectually (*fikriyyan*) and emotionally (*nafsiyyun*), except with this specific type of living' nor they feel with happiness except with it.

Islam came as a collection of concepts (*mafaheem*) about life. It came as general guidelines (*khutoot 'areedah*), ie general imports that treat all man's problems in life, where the solution of every problem that occurs to man is actually derived from them. It made all of that based on an intellectual basis (*qaa'idah fikriyyah*); under which all the thoughts about life enter; and it is used as a criterion (*miqyaas*) upon which every detailed thought is measured. It also made the rules, in terms of solutions, thought and opinions, emanating from the 'aqeedah and derived from the general guidelines.

It determined the thoughts for man, but it did not restrict his mind; it rather freed it.

It restricted his behaviour in life with particular thoughts, but it did not restrict man; it rather freed him.

Thus, the view of the Muslim towards the worldly life became that of promising hope, a realistic seriousness and a view that values life with its (true) measure, in terms that it must be earned and that it is not an objective, nor it is proper to be an objective. So the Muslim strives in the walks of life, earns of the providence (*rizq*) of Allah (swt), and enjoys the ornaments of Allah (swt) that He provided to His servants and also the good forms of *rizq*. However, he realises that the *dunya* is temporary, while the *akhirah* is the abode of eternity.

Rules of Islam came to treat for man the matters of trade as well as the matters of prayers, in a particular way. They also treat the problems of marriage as well as the matters of charity, in a specific way. They demonstrate the matter of property ownership and the matter of its expense, in a certain way. They also detail the supplications (*du'as*) and worships, and explain the legal punishments (*hudood*), capital offences (*jinaayaat*) and the various punishments (*'uqoobaat*); as well as they explain the chastiment of hell (*jahannum*) and the felicity of paradise (*jannah*). They guide him to the form of government (*Hukum*) and its method, in a specific fashion. They also direct him to the personal/self-acting aspiration to apply the rules in quest of the pleasure of Allah (swt). They direct him to the relationship of the state with the rest of the states, peoples and nations, as they direct him to carry the *da'wah* for mankind. They oblige him to acquire the elevated attributes, as rules (*ahkaam*) coming from Allah (swt), and not as good attributes among people.

Thus Islam came to regulate all man's relationships with himself and with people the same way it regulates his relationship with Allah (swt); all of that in the same system of thought and treatment. Man, thus, became obliged to proceed in this worldly life by a specific motivation, in a specific and determined path and for a defined and designated goal.

Islam obliges people to restrict themselves to this path alone exclusively. It warned them of painful chastisement in the *akhirah*, as well as of strict punishment in the *dunya*; where one of these two will inevitably fall on them if they deviated from this path, even a hair breadth.

Accordingly, the Muslim comes to proceed in this life in a particular way, and live in a certain way, within a specific mode by virtue of his embracement of the ‘aqeedah of Islam, and the obligation of his obedience to the commands and prohibitions of Allah (swt) that restrict him with the rules of Islam.

This specific type of living within a particular understanding of life and specific conduct in a defined path, is inevitably imposed upon every Muslim and all Muslims.

Islam mentioned that explicitly and clearly in the Book and the Sunnah, in both the Islamic ‘aqeedah and the ahkaam shar’eeah.

Hence Islam is not a spiritual deen (religion) only, and nor theological or priestly concepts. It is rather a particular way of life, which every Muslim and all Muslims must have their life be in accordance with this way alone.

Allah (swt) is a truth whose existence is perceived and not an idea imagined by the mind.

Many people on the face of the earth, particularly in the West, have conviction in Allah (swt) and believe Him. However, their conviction and belief are based on the fact that Allah (swt) is a thought and not a truth. Such people consider the belief in the existence of a god is belief in the existence of the idea of deity, an idea which they say is nice. This is because, as long as man imagines it and believes in it, and submits to its power, then he alienates himself from evil and gets close to goodness by the incentive of this idea. It is thus an internal deterrent that has more influence than the external deterrent. That is why they advocate that man must believe in Allah (swt) and they view the necessity of encouraging this belief, so that people remain righteous and motivated, which they call ‘the religious restraint’ (*al-wa’azi ad-deeni*).

Such people are easy to be drawn to atheism, and close to apostate from their belief once the mind indulged in thinking to perceive the existence of this idea. If man did not perceive its presence and did not realise an effect for this presence, he would deny the existence of a god and thus disbelieved in Allah (swt). Moreover, belief in that Allah is an idea and not a truth makes the goodness also just an idea and not a truth and makes evil also just an idea and not a truth. What led these people to this type of belief (eeman) is that they did not use the mind (‘aql) to reach belief (eeman) in Allah (swt), and nor they were guided to solve rationally the great problem that results from the natural questions about the universe, man and life, about what is before the worldly life and what is after it, and its relationship with what is before it and what is after it. The solution was rather taught to them according to the wish of their instructor, so they accepted this solution and continued to believe in it without having real perception of the existence of that which they believed in. Many of them tried to use their mind, but they were answered that the religion is beyond the mind and forced to silence.

That which is right is that Allah (swt) is a truth and not an idea; and that His (swt) existence is touched and conceived, though His (swt) essence is impossible to be realised. Don’t you see man can hear the sound of the plane in the sky without seeing it because he sits inside his room? However, he realises its existence from sensing its sound though he did not see it and did not sense its essence. Thus he believes in the presence of a plane in the sky from hearing its sound. In other words, he believes, certainly and definitely, in the existence of the plane. Thus, comprehending the existence of the plane is a matter different to comprehending its entity. Comprehension of its entity does not happen because of the absence of the senses of

its entity. While the comprehension of its existence is definite from the sensation of its sound. So, the existence of the plane is a truth and not (only) an idea. This is the case of the comprehended and sensed things. Their existence is definite for they are observed and sensed. Their need for other than them is also definite, because it is observed and sensed. The celestial bodies are in need for the system; and the fire is in need for the one who uses it in order to burn. This is the case of every comprehended and sensed thing in being in need of other than itself. The needy thing can't be eternal, for if it was eternal it would have not needed for other than itself. The fact that it is needy/dependent means that it is not eternal. Therefore, the fact that all the comprehended and sensed things are created is definite. This is because that which is not eternal (*azali*) means it is created by a Creator. The sensation of these created things, as well as the sensation of the sound of the plane, is definite. Similarly, the existence of the Creator of these created things (objects) from which they come is like the existence of the plane from which the sound came; it is a definite matter. Thus, the existence of the Creator of these created things (objects) is a definite matter. Accordingly, man comprehended the created things (objects) through his sensation and mind; and he comprehended from his sensation of them the existence of their Creator, definitely. Thus, the existence of the Creator is a truth which man has touched its existence through sensation; and it is not an idea which man imagined in his mind.

Rationally, this Creator must be eternal (*azali*). Had it been not eternal, then it would be dependent, thus it would be created. Since nature is not eternal, because it is in need to function in accordance with specific determined ratios and situations it can't but to be bound by them, then it is of these ratios and situations. Since matter is not eternal, because it is dependent, for it can't transform from one state to another except through a specific **proliferation** and specific ratios; and it can't but to be bound by these ratios and this amount of **proliferation**. Thus it is needy. Accordingly nature is not creator, for it is not eternal and pre-existent; and matter is not also creator, for it is not eternal and pre-existent. It thus only remains that the Creator is Allah T'aala. In other words, the Creator is that eternal (*azali*) and pre-existent (*qadeem*) which people call it Allah or God or *Ilaheen* or the like of names which all indicate one designated thing, that is Allah (swt), ie the eternal and pre-existent Creator.

Thus, Allah (swt) is a truth whose existence is sensed from the existence of His creatures. When man fears Allah (swt) he fears of an entity which truly exists, and whose existence is conceived by sensation. When man worships Allah (swt), he worships an entity which truly exists and whose existence is conceived by sensation. When he seeks the pleasure of Allah (swt), he seeks the pleasure of an entity which truly exists, and whose existence is conceived by sensation. Accordingly, man would be afraid of Allah (swt), worshipping Allah (swt) and seeking the pleasure of Allah (swt), with certainty that is not subject to any doubt.

Ideology (al-Mabda')

Mabda', linguistically is a verbal noun (masdar) beginning with 'm' (meem), and derived from the verb bada'a (started), yabda'n (starts), bad'nn (starting) and *mabda'* (starting point, principle). According to the conventional use of all people, *mabd'a* means the basic thought (fikir) upon which thoughts are built. So a person might say: *mabda'i huwas sidq* (my principle is truthfulness), where he means that the basis upon which I build my actions is the truthfulness (*sidq*). Another person might say: *mabda'i huwal wafaa'* (my principle is faithfulness), where he means that the basis upon which he builds his transactions is the faithfulness, etc. Thus, people also called *mabd'a* on partial thoughts that are suitable for other partial thoughts as basic thoughts. So they called truthfulness (*sidq*) as *mabda'*, good neighbourhood (*husnul juwar*) as *mabda'* and cooperation (*ta'awun*) as *mabda'*. Based on that they spoke of *mabdi'rul-Akhlaaq* (principles of ethics), *mabadi'ul-iqtisaad* (principles of economy), *mabadi'ul-qanoon* (principles of law) and *mabadi'ul-ijtimaa* (social principles) etc. They meant by that particular thoughts of economy, upon which (other) thoughts which are derived from them are built; and particular thoughts of law upon which (other) thoughts which are derived from them are built. So they called such particular thoughts as economic principles and legal principles, and so on. In truth, these are not principles (*mabadi'* – pl. of *mabda'*); they are rather general principles (*qawa'id*) or thoughts (*afkar*). This is because *mabda'* is a basic thought, while these are not basic thoughts; they are rather partial thoughts (*afkar far'iyyah*). The fact that (other) thoughts are built on them does not make them at all, basic thoughts. They rather remain to be partial thoughts (*afkar far'iyyah*), even if (other) thoughts were built on them or were derived from them; as long as they themselves were not basic (*asassiyyah*); rather they are derived from other thoughts; or all of them are derived from a basic thought (*fikir asaasi*).

Truthfulness, faithfulness and cooperation and others are partial thoughts (*afkar far'iyyah*) and not basic thoughts (*afkar asassiyyah*). This is because they are derived from a basic thought, rather than being themselves the basis (*al-asis*), for truthfulness (*sidq*) is a branch of a basis; it is a hukum shar'i derived from the Qur'an, for Muslims; and it is a nice and beneficial characteristic derived from the capitalist thought for the non-Muslims.

Therefore, a thought is not called *mabda'* unless it is a basic thought from which thoughts are derived. The basic thought (*al-fikir ul-asis*) is that which there is not at all, a thought before it. This basic thought is confined to the collective thought (*al-fikrah al-kulliyyah*) about the universe, man and life. There is no basic thought other than this. This is because this thought is the basis in worldly life. If man contemplated himself he finds himself a man that lives in the universe. So unless he has a thought about himself, life and the universe in terms of existence and creation, he would not be able to provide a thought suitable to be a basis for his life. Therefore, his life remains functioning without a basis, unstable, whimsical and changeable unless this basic thought existed, in other words, unless the collective thought about himself, about the life and about the universe existed.

Therefore, the collective thought about the universe, man and life is the basic thought, and it is the 'aqeedah. However, thoughts can't emanate from this 'aqeedah nor be built on it, unless itself is a thought, ie, unless it was the result of intellectual study/discussion. If, otherwise, it was (only) submission and instruction, then it would not be thought, nor called a collective thought, though it is correct to be called 'aqeedah. Therefore, man must reach to the collective thought through the mind ('aql), ie, it should result from rational study. It would be then a rational creed, and thoughts would then be derived from it and built on it. Such thoughts are

the solutions for the worldly life problems. In other words, these thoughts are the rules (ahkaam) that regulate the life affairs of man. Once this rational creed existed, and rules (ahkaam) that treat the life's problems emanated from it, then the ideology (*mabda'*) existed. Accordingly, the ideology is defined as a rational creed from which a system emanates. Thereupon, Islam is an ideology, because it is a rational creed from shar'eeah, for they treat the problems of life. Likewise, Communism is an ideology, because it is a rational creed from which a system emanates. This system is the thoughts that treat the problems of life. Capitalism is also an ideology, because it is a rational creed, upon which thoughts, that treat life's problems, are built.

Hence, it appears also that Nationalism (*qawmi'yyah*) is not an ideology, nor Patriotism (*watani'yyah*), Nazism or Existentialism (*wujoodiyyah*). This is because each one of them is not a rational creed, nor there is a system that emanates from it or there are any thoughts, that treat the problems of life, that are built on it.

As for the religion, if its creed was rational reached to through the mind and from which a system, that treats life's problems, emanates or thoughts are built on it, then such a religion is an ideology, upon which the definition of ideology applies. However, if its creed was not rational, rather it was emotional that has been given through instruction and acceptance of it was requested without mind's discussion; and there was no system that emanates from it, nor there are thoughts built on it; then all religions of that type are not an ideology. This is because their creed is not rational, nor there are life's systems that emanate from it.

Criterion of Actions (Miqyas ul-a'mal)

Many people proceed in life aimlessly, so they undertake their actions without a criterion to which they measure. Therefore, you see them undertake bad actions they think of them as good. They abstain from undertaking good actions they think of them as bad. The Muslim woman that walks in the streets of the main Islamic cities, such as Beirut, Damascus, Cairo and Baghdad, while uncovering her legs, and showing her beauty and charms, thinking that she undertakes a good action. Similarly, the righteous person who adheres to the mosques, abstains from talking about the corrupt actions of the rulers, because this is politics, and he thinks talking in politics is bad. Such a woman and such a man had fallen in sin. She uncovered her *awrah*, and he did not take care of the Muslims affairs. This is because they did not take for themselves a criterion to which they measure their actions. Had they taken a criterion, then they would not have such contradiction of their actions with the ideology that they openly declare to embrace. Therefore, it is necessary that man has a criterion to which he measures his actions, so as to know the reality of the action before he undertakes it.

Islam assigned for man a criterion to which he measures his actions, so he knows which of them is bad and which is good. He then abstains from the bad action and performs the good action. This criterion is the Shar'a only. Thus, what the Shar'a considers as good action is good, and what it considers as bad action is bad. This criterion is constant, so the good would not become bad, and nor the bad would become good. Rather, what the Shar'a views as good remains good, and what the Shar'a views as bad remains bad.

Thus, man would proceed in a straight path and with awareness, so he understands the matters as they are. This is different to the case if he did not make the Shar'a criterion for good and bad, rather he made the mind a criterion for himself. In such case, he would proceed haphazardly, because a matter becomes good in a certain situation and bad in another, for the mind might see the thing itself good today and bad tomorrow. He might see it good in one country and bad in another. Thus his judgement on things becomes unstable; and the good and bad become relative and not real. Then he would fall in the predicament of undertaking the bad action while thinking it is good; and abstains from the good action while thinking it is bad.

Therefore, reference must be made to Shar'a, and it must be taken as a criterion for all actions, and to make good that which Shar'a views as good, and to make bad that which Shar'a views as bad.

Religiousness is an Instinct

There is live energy in man that drives him to undertake actions and requires satisfaction. This life energy has two aspects: one of them requires inevitable satisfaction, and man would die if it is not satisfied. This is the organic needs, such as eating, drinking and response to nature's call. The second one requires satisfaction, but man does not die because of not satisfying it, though he would be worried until he satisfies it; and this is the instincts, whose action would be through a natural feeling that outbursts requiring satisfaction. However, the instincts are different to the organic needs in terms of agitation. This is because the organic needs are agitated from inside while what agitates the instincts or shows the feeling of need for satisfaction is either thoughts about what incites the emotions come to mind, or it is a tangible reality that makes the emotions requiring satisfaction. The procreation instinct (*ghareezal-un-naw'*) for example, is agitated by thinking of a beautiful girl, or of anything related to sex or to seeing a beautiful girl or anything related to sex. If nothing of that happened, then nothing would occur to agitate the instinct. Similarly the religiousness instinct (*ghareezat-ud-dayyun*) is agitated by thinking in the verses (aayaat) of Allah (swt), the Doomsday or what is related to that, the contemplation in the perfect creation of Allah (swt) in the heavens and the earth or what is related to that. Thus, the effects of the instinct appear when there is something of that which agitates it. We do not see such effects in case of the absence of what agitates it, or in case of transferring what agitates it from agitation by misinterpreting it in a way that makes the person lose the concept of its original characteristic that incites the instinct.

Religiousness instinct is natural and constant, for it is the feeling of need to the Creator and the Sustainer, regardless of the interpretation of that Creator and Sustainer. This feeling is innate in man as a man, whether he believes in the existence of the Creator or he disbelieves in Him, but believes in the matter or the nature. The presence of this feeling in man is inevitable, because it is created in a man as part of his creation; and it is not possible to be secluded nor detached from him. This is religiousness.

The manifestation of this religiousness is sanctification (*taqdees*) of what is believed to be the Creator and Sustainer or what is conceived that the Creator and Sustainer incarnated in it. Sanctification could appear in its true manifestation, so it is called worship ('ibadah). It might also appear in a lower form, which is reverence and glorification.

Sanctification is the ultimate heartfelt respect. It does not result from fear, rather from religiousness. This is because the manifestation of fear is not sanctification, it is rather flattering, escape of defence; all of that contradict the reality of sanctification. Thus, sanctification is manifestation of religiousness and not of fear. Therefore, religiousness is an instinct independent of the survival instinct, which fear is one of its manifestations. That is why man is religious, and we find him worship something since Allah (swt) brought him on the face of earth. He worshipped the sun, planets, fire and idols. He also worshipped Allah (swt). We do not see in any age, a nation or a people without worshipping something. Even the peoples, which the authority forced them to abandon religiousness, they were religious and worshipping something, despite the force imposed upon them. They suffered great deal of harm in pursuit of performing their worship. There is no force that can strip religiousness from man, remove from him the sanctification of the Creator and prevent him from worship. It can rather suppress that for a time. This is because worship ('ibadah) is a natural manifestation of religiousness, which is a natural instinct in man.

As regards to what appears on some atheists in terms of absence of worship or mockery of worship, the religiousness instinct in such people has been turned away from worshipping Allah to worshipping the creatures. Its manifestation has been thus made in sanctification of the nature, heroic gigantic things and the like. To achieve this distraction, distortion and erroneous explanation of things have been used.

Therefore, kufr (disbelief) is more difficult than eeman (belief), because it is distraction of man from his innate nature (*fitrah*) and transferring it from its true manifestations. This would require a great effort. How much it is hard for man to turn away from what is necessary to his innate nature (*fitrah*).

Therefore, we find the truth (haqq) is revealed to the atheists, and they sense the existence of Allah (swt) and thus realise His existence by mind in a decisive way, you find them rush to eeman and feel with comfort and tranquillity; and a heavy nightmare that used to burden them would disappear. The eeman of such people would be strong and steadfast, for it came through sensation and certainty. This is because their mind was linked with their emotion, so they realised the existence of Allah (swt) in certainty, and they had certain feeling of his existence. Thus their innate nature (*fitrah*) met with their mind, thus producing strong eeman.

The Duty of Sufficiency is a duty upon every Muslim.

Al-Fard (duty) is the speech of the Legislator related to the decisive request of performing an action. This is like His (swt) saying:

“Establish the Prayer” [TMQ Al-Baqarah:43]

“Go forth, light and heavy, and strive in the way of Allah”

It is also like his (saw) saying: “**The imam was made so that he is followed**” and “**Whoever dies without having a pledge (bai’ah) on his neck, he dies the death of Jahiliyyah.**” All of these texts are speech of the Legislator related to decisive request of (performing) an action. What makes the request decisive is the connotation (*qareerah*) that came connected with the request, thus making it decisive, so it must be performed. The duty would not be abolished in any way unless the obliged action has been performed. The one who neglects the duty deserves punishment for such negligence, and he continues to be sinful until he performed it. There is no difference (in this regard) between the personal duty (*fard ‘ayn*) and collective duty (*fard ul-kifayah*). All of these are duties upon all the Muslims. The saying of Allah (swt): “And establish the prayer” is a personal duty. His (swt) saying: “Go forth, light and heavy, and strive” is a collective duty. Similarly, the saying of Rasool ul-Allah (saw): “**The imam is made so that he is followed**”, is a personal duty. While his (saw) saying, “**Whoever dies without having a pledge on his neck...**” is the Legislator’s speech pertaining to the decisive request of (performing) an action. The trial to differentiate between the personal duty and the collective duty in regards of their obligation is sin in the view of Allah (swt), obstructing from the way of Allah (swt) and deception for the sake of neglecting the performance of the duties of Allah (swt). In regards to abolishing the duty from the one who is obliged of it, there is also no difference between the personal duty and the collective duty. **The duty is not abolished until the action requested by the Legislator has been performed; whether it was requested by the Legislator has been performed;** whether it was requested to be performed by every Muslim, such as the obligatory prayers, or it was requested to be performed by all the Muslims, such as the pledge (bai’ah) of the Khaleefah. Each one of them would not be abolished until the action is performed, ie until the prayer is performed, and the Khaleefah is established and the bai’ah is taken to him. Thus the collective duty is not abolished from any one of the Muslims if some of them work to

perform it, until it is performed. So, every Muslim (who do not work to perform this duty) will remain sinful as long as the carrying the action (to perform the duty) has not been completed.

Therefore, it is wrong to say that the collective duty is that which if some (of the Muslims) undertook it, it would be abolished from the rest (Muslims). Rather, collective duty is that which if some (of the Muslims) completed it, it would be abolished from the remaining (Muslims). Its abolishment then would be eventual, for the requested action has been executed and completed, so there is no scope for it to remain. This is the collective duty. It is the same like the personal duty. Thereupon, establishing the Islamic State is a duty upon all Muslims, i.e., upon every one of the Muslims. This duty would not be abolished from any one of the Muslims until the Islamic State exists. If some (of the Muslims) carry out the actions that establish the Islamic State, then the duty will not be abolished from any Muslims as long as the Islamic State was not established. The duty remains upon every Muslim, and the sin remains upon every Muslim until the Islamic State is established. The sin would not be abolished from any Muslim until he pursues the actions which establish it, and continue on doing so till it is established. Similarly, Jihad against the French in Algeria is a duty upon all Muslims. If the people of Algeria undertook Jihad against the French, this does not abolish the duty from any one of the Muslims until the French are completely driven out of Algeria and the victory of Muslims is achieved. This is the case of every collective duty; thus it remains a duty upon every Muslim, and it is not abolished until the requested action has been completed.

La ilah illa Allah means: There is no one to be worshipped except Allah

Since sanctification is natural in man, then man, by his innate nature, worships something. This is because sanctification is a natural response to religiousness. Therefore, when man performs 'ibadah (worship) he feels with comfort and tranquillity, because by performing the 'ibadah he would have satisfied the religiousness instinct. However, this 'ibadah must not be left to the emotion (*wijdan*) to determine the way it likes, nor the man to perform as he wishes. Rather, the mind should associate with the emotion in determining the thing that must be worshipped. This is because the emotion (*wijdan*) is subject to error and conducive to misguidance (*dalaal*). It is often that emotion (*wijdan*) drives man to worship things that must be destroyed. It is also often that it drives man to sanctify things that must be despised. If, thus, emotion (*wijdan*) was left alone to determine to man what he worships, this would lead to misguidance (*dalaal*) in worshipping other than the Creator, or to superstition manifested in seeking nearness to the Creator through matters that alienate from Him. This is because emotion (*wijdan*) is an instinctive sensation or an inner feeling that appears at the presence of a sensed reality, to which it responds; or it appears from thinking in what agitates that feeling. If man responded to that feeling once it occurred without thinking, then this might lead to misguidance (*dalaal*) or error. For example, you might see, at night, a ghost thinking it is an enemy to you. So, the survival instinct is agitated in you through the manifestation of fear. If you responded to that feeling and did the response that it requires, which is the escape, for example, then this would be wrong to do. This is because you might escape from nothing. You might also escape from something which resistance is the only good thing you have to do. Thus, the response you took was wrong. However, if you use your mind, and think of the feeling that appeared in you before you make the response it requires, then it becomes clear to you what sort of action you have to undertake. It might appear to you that the ghost is an electricity post, a tree or an animal. The fear in you would then disappear and you continue your walk. It might also appear that it is a beast that you can't out run, so you refer to a trick by climbing a tree, or take refuge in a house, thus you save yourself. Therefore, man should not undertake the response required by the instinct except through the use of the mind. In other words, it is not allowed that he undertake actions based on the agitation of the emotion (*wijdan*) alone; it is rather necessary to use the mind and the emotion. Thereupon, sanctification must be built on thinking and not on emotion, because it is a response to the religiousness and not on emotion, because it is a response to the religiousness instinct. So, this response should not be made without thinking because it might lead to misguidance or error. Thus, it is necessary that man does not initiate this response to religiousness instinct, except after thinking, ie, except through the use of mind. Therefore it is not allowed to have worship except in accordance with what the mind directs to, so that this worship be to whom the innate nature (*fitrah*) guides to worship, that is the Creator and Sustainer, to Whom man feels of need to.

The mind necessitates that worship is only for the Creator, for He (swt) is the eternal (*azali*) and He is inevitably existent (*wajib-ul-wujood*). So, worship must not be to other than Him (swt). It is He Who created man, the universe and life; and it is He Who is characterised with the absolutely perfect attribute. If man believed in His existence, it is necessary that he worships Him, and it is necessary that worship be to Him alone. The acceptance of Him being a Creator, by natural innate and mind, obliges that the one who acknowledges this to worship Him. This is because worship is response to his feeling of His (swt) existence; and worship is one of the most important manifestations of gratefulness (*shukr*) which the creature must perform towards the one who bestowed upon him with the bounty of creation and initiation. Thus the innate nature obliges the worship, and the mind obliges the worship. The innate

nature necessitates also that the worship be to this Creator alone and exclusively; and the mind necessitates that the one who deserves worship, greatfulness and praise is only the Creator, to the exclusion of everything else. Therefore, we find those who submitted to the emotion (*wijdan*) alone in generating the response of sanctification (*taqdees*), without using the mind, had went astray. So they worshipped many things, though they acknowledged of the existence of the Creator who is inevitably existent (*waif ul-wujood*), and despite their acknowledgement that his Creator is one. However, when they initiated the response of sanctification, they sanctified the Creator, and sanctified others with Him. So, they worshipped the Creator; and worshipped the creatures, whether considering them as gods that are themselves worthy of worship, or thinking that the Creator was incarnated in them, or he accepts to seek nearness to Him through worshipping them. Thus, the innate nature obliges the existence of a Creator. However, the response of sanctification which is necessary to arise when what agitates the emotions of religiousness occurs, leads to making the sanctification to everything thought to be worthy of worship; whether because it is the Creator, or it is thought that the Creator accepts to sanctify it, or it is thought that the Creator is carnated in it. This leads to worshipping many things, despite the fact that the Creator is one.

Therefore, the concept of polytheism (plurality of gods) was directed to what is worshipped and not towards the Creator. So negation of polytheism must be negation of the worshipped things, and restricting the worship to the Creator, the eternal (*azali*) and inevitably existent (*wajib ul-wujood*).

Islam, accordingly came to explain to all mankind that worship is only to the entity (*dhat*) that is of inevitable existence, who is Allah (swt). It came to demonstrate this explanation through an explicit rational way. It asked them about the thing that has to be worshipped. They answered it is Allah, and committed themselves with the evidence. Allah (swt) says: “” [TMQ Al-Mu’minoan: 84-91]

By this acknowledgement from them that Allah (swt) is the Creator of everything, and His Hand is the dominion over all things, they bound themselves by worshipping Him alone. This is because, according to their confession, He is alone worthy of worship. Islam explained to them in another verse, that other than Allah (swt) does not do anything that deserves worship. So He (swt) said:

“Do you see if Allah took away your hearing and your sight and sealed over your hearts, who is, other than Allah can restore it to you” [TMQ Al-Anam:46]

And He (swt) said: *“Do they have a god other than Allah”* [TMQ At-Tur:43]

Allah has confirmed in Qur’an the unity of the worshipped in many verses, where He emphasised the unification of Allah. So He (swt) said:

“And your god is one god, and there is no god other than Him.” [TMQ Al-Baqarah:163]

“Allah, there is no god except Him” [TMQ Ta-Ha:8]

“And there is no god except Allah, the One, ...” [TMQ Sad:65]

This means there is no one worthy of worship except the inevitably existent (*wajib ul-wujood*) entity (*dhat*), Who is Allah, the One. And He (swt) said:

“And there is no god except one god.” [TMQ Al-Maidah:73]

This means there is no one worthy of worship except the One.

Thus Islam advocates the unification of worship to the inevitably existent (*wajib ul-wujood*) entity (*dhat*), which the mind and innate nature (*fitrah*) confirms its existence, who is Allah. The Quranic verses explicitly indicate in negating polytheism. Allah (swt) says:

“Had therein gods other than Allah, they would have been in disarray”

[TMQ Al-Anbiaa:22]

Thus, the verses came to negate polytheism, and to confine worship to one god, Who is Allah. In other words, they came to establish that the worthy of worship is one, who is the inevitable existent (*wajib ul-wujood*) entity (*dhat*).

'*Ilah*' (god) in language has except one meaning which is 'worshipped' (*ma'bood*). It has no shar'i (divine) meaning other than that. So the meaning of '*la ilaha*' (there is no god) in the language and Shar'a is the same which is 'there is none worthy of worship'. '*Illa Allah*' (except Allah) means in the language and Shar'a the inevitably existent (*wajib ul-wujood*) entity (*dhat*), Who is Allah. Therefore, the meaning of the first Shahadah (witness) of Islam is not only witnessing in the unity of the Creator as many presume; it rather means to witness that there is no one worthy of worship except Allah, the inevitably existent (*wajib ul-wujood*). This in order that Allah alone is worshipped and sanctified; and that worship is negated definitely from anything other than Allah (swt).

Thereupon, the confession in the existence of Allah (swt) is not enough in Oneness (*wahdaniyyah*) there rather must be oneness of the Creator and oneness of the worshipped. This is because the meaning of '*la illah illa Allah*' is that there is no worthy of worship except Allah. Thus, the Shahadah, (witness) of Muslim in that '*la ilaha illa Allah*' definitely binds him to worship Allah, and obliges him to worship Allah alone. Thus, oneness is the sanctification of the Creator alone, ie, to believe that worship is only for Allah (swt), the One.

Rizq is in the Hand of Allah

Rizq (provision) is different than ownership, because provision is granting. Thus, *razaqa* means 'gave'. While ownership is the possession of the thing by any of the means which Shar'a allowed to possess the property with. Rizq could be halal and could be haram. All of it is called rizq. Thus, the property which the worker takes as wage for his work is rizq. Similarly the property which the gambler takes from others in gambling is also rizq, because it is a property that Allah (swt) gave to every one of them, when he carried out one of the cases in which rizq occurs. It dominates on the mind of the people the concept that they provide themselves by them. Thus, the employee who takes a certain salary through his effort and work, thinks that he provided himself. When he gets an increase (in his salary) based on an effort he did, or based on the strive for increase, he thinks that he provided himself with this increase. The merchant who profits a property through his strive in trading, thinks that he provided himself. The doctor who treats the sick people for a wage, thinks that he provides himself. Thus, everybody who undertakes an action from which he earns a property, thinks that he provides himself. This view the people hold is because they did not understand the cases in which rizq comes to them, so thought their cases to be causes (*asbab*).

The fact in which the Muslim accepts is that rizq is from Allah (swt) and not from man. The cases in which rizq comes are only situations in which rizq occurs, and they are not causes from which rizq results. Had these been causes they would have not failed (to produce rizq) at all, though it is noticed through sensation that they fail, for these cases may happen and yet rizq does not occur. Had they been causes (*asbab*), then their effect, which is the rizq, would have inevitably resulted. Since rizq does not inevitably result from them; it rather comes when they occur and it fails despite their occurrence. This indicates that these are not causes (*asbab*); they are rather cases (*halah*). Moreover, the cases in which the rizq comes as their occurrence can't be considered cases (*asbab*) or rizq; nor the person who undertakes these cases can be considered the one who brings the rizq through them. This is because this contradicts with the Quranic text, which is definite in proof and definite in meaning (*qat' iyuth-thuboot wa qat'iy ud-dalalah*). **If anything contradicts with a text, that is definite in proof and definite in meaning, then this definite text is adopted, followed and everything else is rejected.** There are many verses that indicate clearly, in a way that is not subject for interpretation (*ta'weel*) that rizq is from Allah (swt) alone, and not from man.

This is what makes us confirm that what we witness of styles and means, by which rizq comes are only cases in which rizq occurs. Allah (swt) says:

"And eat of what Allah provided to you." [TMQ Al-Maidah:88]

"Who created you then provided to you." [TMQ Ar-Rum:40]

"Spend of what Allah provided to you." [TMQ Ya-sin:47]

"Indeed Allah provides to whom He likes." [TMQ Al-Imran:37]

"Allah provides to it and to your." [TMQ Al-Ankabut:60]

"We provide to you." [TMQ Ta-Ha:132]

"We provide to your (plural) and to them." [TMQ Al-Anam:151]

"We provide to them and to you (plural)." [TMQ 17:31]

"Indeed Allah will provide to them." [TMQ Al-Hajj:58]

"Allah makes rizq abundant to whom He likes." [TMQ Ar-Rad:26]

"So seek the rizq from Allah." [TMQ Al-Ankabut:17]

"There is no beast in the earth, but its rizq is with Allah." [TMQ Hud:6]

"Indeed Allah is the Razaq (Sustainer)." [TMQ Az-Zariyat:58]

These ayaat, besides others, are definite in their meaning, and are not subject except to one meaning that does not need interpretation, that rizq is from Allah (swt) alone, and not from any other else. However, Allah commanded His servants to undertake actions, He made them capable to choose to perform the cases by which rizq comes. They are the ones who by their choice, undertake all the cases by which rizq comes. However, they are not the ones who bring the rizq. This is in the explicit text of the ayaat that Allah is the one who provides them in these cases, regardless of whether the rizq being halal or haram, and regardless of whether these cases have been obliged, prohibited or allowed by Allah; and regardless of whether rizq occurred or not by them. However, Islam explained the manner by which the Muslim is allowed to undertake the case by which rizq occurs, and the manner by which he is not allowed to undertake such case. So, Islam demonstrated means of ownership and not the cause of rizq, and it limited ownership to these means. So, nobody is allowed to own rizq except through a legal means, for this is the halal rizq; and anything else is haram rizq. This is despite all rizq, whether halal or haram, is from Allah (swt).

Confinement by the Ahkam Shar'eeah is obliged by the belief in Islam

Actions which human perform by their choice before the advent of Shar'a have no rule. So they are neither obliged upon them, nor preferable (mandoob), or prohibited (haram), or disliked (makrooh) or allowed (mubah). They rather undertake them in accordance with what they view of interest to them. This is because there is no legal responsibility (*takleef*) before the advent of Shar'a. Allah (swt) says:

"We never punish until We have sent a messenger." [TMQ Al-Israa:15]

With this ayah, Allah (swt) secured His creatures of the punishment on what we carry out of actions before sending messengers, because they are not charged with any rules. Once Allah sent them a messenger they become bound with what that messenger brought to them; and they could have no argument for not abiding by the ahkaam which the messenger brought. Allah (swt) says:

"So that men may have no argument against Allah after the messenger."

[TMQ An-Nisaa:165]

So, whoever does not believe in that messenger would be responsible before Allah (swt) for his belief and his abidement with the rules (ahkaam) he brought. The one who believed in him he would be confined by the ahkaam which he brought and responsible for not following any one of the rules he brought. Accordingly, Muslims are commanded to undertake their actions in accordance with the rules of Islam, because they are obliged to conduct their actions in accordance with the orders and prohibitions of Allah. He (swt) says:

"And whatever the messenger brought to you take it, and whatever he forbade you abstain from it." [TMQ Al-Hashr:7]

It is incorrect to say here that which he did not bring to you and he did not forbid you from it, you are charged of it. This is because charging with Shar'a covers all the message to man and not to some of his actions. Allah (swt) says:

"Say: 'O mankind! I am the messenger of Allah to all of you.'" [TMQ Al-Araf:158]

So it becomes necessary that what he brought to you is the rule of every action and what he forbid to you is the rule of every action. Thereupon, every Muslim who wants to undertake any action to satisfy his needs and to discharge his interests, he is legally obliged to know the rule of Allah (swt) regarding such action before he undertakes it, so that he acts on it in accordance with the hukum shar'i. It is incorrect to say there are things that happen which the Shar'a did not mention, so it left the choice to us to do them or not. This is because that means that the sharee'ah is deficient and not suitable except for the time it came in. This contradicts the sharee'ah itself and to the reality it applies to. The sharee'ah did not bring detailed rules for specific matters so as to be restricted to the time. It rather brought general imports for the problems of man as man, regardless of the place and time. All the detailed actions come under these imports. If a problem occurred or an incident took place, it is studied and its reality is understood, then its solution is deduced from the general imports that came in the sharee'ah. The deduced opinion would be the rule of Allah (swt) to this problem or that incident. The Muslims proceeded on this course since the death of Rasool ul-Allah (saw) until the departure of the Islamic State. The Muslims holding to Islam are still proceeding on this course. Problems occurred at the time of Abu Bakr (ra) which did not exist at the time of the Rasool (saw), and problems occurred, for example, at the time of Haroon ar-Rasheed which did not exist at the time of Abu Bakr (ra). The Mujtahids which were counted in hundreds and thousands deduced to these problems ahkam sharee'ah which were not known before. This is the way they proceeded in every problem and every incident. This

is because the Islamic sharee'ah is comprehensive; so there is not any problem except it has a room for a rule, and there is no any case except it has a rule. Therefore, every Muslim must restrict his actions with the ahkam sharee'ah, and he should not undertake any action except in accordance with the orders and prohibitions of Allah (swt).

Death does not occur except with the End of Ajal (life-term)

Many people think that though death is the same, the causes of death are numerous. So death could be because of detrimental disease, such as the plague. It could also be due to stab by a knife, or a gun shot or burning by fire of beheading or heart attack or others. In their view, all of these are direct causes that lead to death, ie death occurs because of them. That is why it became common on their mouth the phrase, “The causes are many but the death is the same.”

The truth is that death is the same and its cause (*sabab*) is also the same, which is the end of ajal (life-term), and nothing else. As regards to these matters, which take place and due to them death occurs, they are cases in which death occurs and are not causes of death.

This is because the case (*sabab*) produces the effects (*musabbab*) definitely; and that the effect (*musabbab*) can't result except from its cause (*sabab*) alone. This is different to the case (*halalah*), it is a specific circumstance within certain surrounding conditions in which death usually takes place. However, death could fail to happen. Thus, the case might exist but the death does not occur; and the death might occur while the case did not happen.

The one who examines many of the things in which death occurs, and the one who examines the death itself, finds that these matters might take place but the death does not occur. Death might also occur while these cases did not take place. As an example, a person might be fatally stabbed by a knife, and the doctors agree unanimously that it is fatal, but the stabbed person did not die, rather he healed and recovered. Death could also occur without an apparent cause, such as when the heart of somebody stopped suddenly and he died immediately without all the doctors being able to discover a reason for this heart attack after the painstaking examination.

The incidents about this are many and are known by the doctors. The hospitals have witnessed thousands of these incidents; where a cause that usually leads certainly to death occurs, then the person does not die; and death occurs suddenly without the appearance of any cause that lead to it. Therefore, all the doctors say that the so and so sick man has no hope (of life) according to the instructions of medicine, but he might recover, and this is beyond our knowledge. They also say that so and so person is beyond the danger (on his life), and he is healthy, and he passed the point of danger, then he suddenly suffers a relapse and dies. All of this is tangible reality sensed by the people and doctors; and it clearly indicates that these matters from which death occurs are not causes for death. For if they were causes they would not fail (in bringing death) and death would have not occurred, by other than them. The fact that they failed (to cause death) even once, and that death occurred by other than them, even once, definitely indicates that they are not causes, they are rather cases. The true cause of death that produces the effect is other than them and not them.

This actual cause could not be discovered by the mind, for it does not fall under sensation. So it is necessary that Allah (swt) tells us about it; and that it is proved by an evidence that is definite in proof and definite in meaning. Allah (swt) has informed us, in many ayaat that it is the ajal (end of life-term); and that Allah (swt) is the One Who causes death. Thus death occurs because of the ajal and the one who causes death is Allah (swt). There are many verses that mentioned this. Allah (swt) says:

“No soul can ever die except by Allah’s leave and at a term appointed.”

[TMQ Al-Imran:145]

“Allah receives (men’s) souls at the time of their death.” [TMQ Az-Zumar:42]

“My Lord is He Who gives life and causes death.” [TMQ Al-Baqarah:258]

“And Allah gives life and causes death.” [TMQ Al-Imran:156]

“Wherever you are death reaches you, even if you were in lofty towers.”

[TMQ An-Nisaa:78]

“Say (to them): ‘The angel of death, who has charge concerning you, will take you to death.’

” [TMQ As-Sajda:11]

“Say (to them): ‘The death which you are fleeing from will surely meet you.’”

[TMQ Al-Jumua:8]

“We mete out death among you.” [TMQ Al-Waqia:60]

“Lo! The term of Allah when it comes, can’t be delayed.” [TMQ Nuh:4]

“When their term comes, then they can’t put it off an hour, not hasten (it).”

[TMQ Yunus:49]

These and other verses are definite in proof that they are from Allah (swt), and definite in meaning that Allah is He Who causes death; and that cause of death is the end of life term (*intihaa’ ul- ‘ajal*), and not the case in which death occurred.

Therefore, it is obligatory that the Muslim believes by mind and Shar’a that what he thinks of as causes to death are not causes, rather they are cases; and that the cause is other than them. It has been proved by Shar’a through the definite evidence that death is in the Hand of Allah, that Allah is He Who causes death and that the cause of death is *intihaa’ ul- ‘ajal*. Once the *ajal* came, it can’t be delayed or hastened; nor is there any person who can avert from death or to escape from it absolutely. Thus it will most certainly reach him.

As regards what man was ordered to avert and work to distance from himself, it is the cases from which death occurs. So, he must not submit himself to any of the cases from which death occurs usually. As for death, he should not be scared of, nor to flee from, because he can never save himself from it. This is because man does not die except after the end of his *ajal*, whether he died naturally, or by killing or burning or any other thing. So death is in the Hand of Allah (swt) and *ajal* is in the Hand of Allah (swt).

Jihad is a duty upon all Muslims

Jihad is spending the effort in the fight *fee sabeeli Allah* (for the sake of Allah), either directly or by providing aid with a property or an opinion, or by mobilising people or other. Fight to raise high the word of Allah (swt) is Jihad.

As for Jihad by an opinion *fee sabeeli Allah*, if it was an opinion related to a battle, or giving an opinion in regards to a plan for fight, then it is Jihad. While giving an opinion over one of the affairs of the enemy, then it would not be considered Jihad.

Giving a speech or make a writing, if it was a speech in the army to encourage/agitate it at the battle, or it was writing for the fight directly, then this is Jihad. If it was otherwise, it would not be considered Jihad. Thus Jihad is specific with fight and what is directly linked to fight. Mujahidoon are those who actually fight. Jihad is a duty proved by the text of Quran and hadeeth. Allah (swt) says:

“And fight them until there is no more persecution and deen (religion) is all for Allah.”

[TMQ Al-Anfal:39]

“Fight against such of those who have been given the scriptures as believe not in Allah nor the Last Day, and forbid not that which Allah has forbidden by His messenger, and follow not the deen (religion) of truth, until they pay the jizyah (tribute) readily, being brought down.”

[TMQ At-Tauba:29]

“O you who believe! Fight those of the disbelievers who are near to you, and let them find harshness in you, and know that Allah is with the righteous (muttaqeen).”

[TMQ At-Tauba:123]

“Lo! Allah has bought from the believers their lives and their wealth because the Garden (Jannah) will be theirs; they shall fight in the way of Allah, and shall slay and be slain. It is a promise which is binding on Him in the Torah and the Gospel and the Qur’an. Who fulfils his covenant better than Allah? Rejoice then in your bargain that you have made; for that is the supreme triumph.” [TMQ At-Tauba:111]

Rasool ul-Allah (saw) also said:

“I have been commanded to fight against the people until they say, ‘La ilaha illa Allah.’”

”

And he (saw) said:

“Jihad with continue till the Doomsday.”

And he (saw) said:

“I have been sent with the sword before the Hour (a-Saa’ah).”

He (saw) said in the hadeeth narrated by al-Hasan (ra):

“A going out or returning back in the way of Allah (fee sabeeli Allah) is better than the Duny and all that is in it.”

Jihad, initially, is a collective duty, and it is a personal duty (fard ‘ayn) if the enemy attacked (Muslims). The meaning of Jihad being a collective duty initially is that we initiate a fight against the enemy even if it did not start a fight against us. If nobody of the Muslims started a fight initially in any time, then all Muslims will be sinful for abandoning it. If the enemy attacked the Muslims, the duty of Jihad will not be abolished from the people of India and Indonesia by the fight undertaken by the people of Egypt and Iraq. It is rather obliged on those most nearer to the enemy until sufficiency is fulfilled by those who undertook the actual fight. If sufficiency cannot be achieved except by all the Muslims, then Jihad becomes a personal duty (fard ‘ayn) on every Muslim.

This is similar to establishing the Islamic State; it is duty upon all Muslims. If some of the Muslims established the state, then the duty of its establishment will be abolished. However, the sin due to their negligence in work for its establishment, before it is established, will not be abolished. If Muslims did not establish it, its duty will remain upon all Muslims till the sufficiency for its establishment is achieved by establishing it actually. Likewise, the Jihad, if the enemy was not driven away, will remain as a duty upon Muslims until the enemy is driven away.

This is the source of error in the jurist's definition of fard ul-kifayah (collective duty), as being that which if some (of the Muslims) undertook it will be abolished from the rest (of them). This definition would mean that if the people of Algeria undertook Jihad against France actually, then Jihad is abolished from the remaining Muslims, whether France left Algeria or not. This is because, according to their definition, some of the Muslims undertook the duty, which is the Jihad, so it is abolished from the rest. This is wrong, without difference about it between Muslims since the time of Rasool ul-Allah (saw) till today. It also contradicts the definite text of Qur'an regarding the obligation of Jihad till the enemy surrenders.

The text of Qur'an is definite in making Jihad against France in Algeria as a duty upon all Muslims and not upon the people of Algeria (only). If the people of Algeria actually undertook Jihad, the duty will not be abolished from the people of Egypt, the people of Iraq or others. It rather, remains as a duty upon them, and they remain sinful by neglecting it, until France actually leaves.

Therefore, the jurists' definition of 'fard ul-kifayah' (collective duty) was wrong. The correct definition is that fard ul-kifayah remains as a duty and it is not abolished until the matter, for whose sake the duty existed, has been achieved. Thus if it was achieved, the duty is abolished, otherwise it is not.

Thus, establishing the Islamic State is obligatory upon all Muslims. If a party (hizb) undertook the action to establish it, its duty will not be abolished. It rather remains as a duty upon all the Muslims till it is actually established. Its duty would not be abolished except from those who pursued the actual action for it; and the sin remains upon the remaining (people). This is similar to the Jihad against France in Algeria, and the Jihad against Britain in Oman; all of this is fard upon all the Muslims. If the people of Algeria undertook Jihad against France, and the people of Oman undertook Jihad against Britain, then the duty of Jihad against these two states is not abolished. It rather remains as a duty upon all the Muslims until France and Britain are actually driven out. The sin of its duty will not be abolished except from the people of Algeria and people of Oman only; and it remains on the rest (of Muslims).

The colonialist disbelievers have occupied today some of the Muslim countries, so Jihad is a duty upon all the Muslims, and it remains as duty upon all of them. They will remain sinful due to its negligence until all the lands of Islam are cleared of the authority of the disbelievers from the foreign states, and the Muslims start the fight against their enemies. If this actually occurred, then its duty will be abolished from the remaining Muslims. However, before this has been achieved, the duty of Jihad remains upon all the Muslims, and they would be sinful due to their negligence of it; this is even if some of them actually undertook Jihad, but what Jihad was undertaken for its sake has not been achieved.

The Five Rules

Al-hukm ush-Shar'i (divine rule) is the Legislator's speech pertaining to the actions of men. Thus al-hukm ush-Shar'i is established by the proof of the speech; and it is identified through understanding the meaning of the speech. The Legislator's speech is that which came in the Kitab and Sunnah, of orders and prohibitions. Therefore, understanding of the hukm Shar'i depends on understanding the Kitab and Sunnah, for they are the origin of Legislation and the source of ahkam (rules).

However, it is not (true) that every Legislator's speech must be undertaken, and there is a punishment for its negligence; or it is forbidden to undertake and there is a punishment for doing it. Rather, this depends on the type of speech. Therefore, it is sin and insolence against the deen of Allah (swt) that a person rushes to state that this (matter) is fard, just because he read a verse or a hadeeth that indicates the request of performing it; or he rushes to give a fatwa (legal view) that this (matter) is haram, just because he read an ayah or a hadeeth which indicates the request of abandoning it.

The Muslims are afflicted, these days, with many of such people who rush to make (matters) halal and haram, just by reading the order or the forbiddance in an ayah or a hadeeth. It is often that these people are from amongst those who discovered that they understood before they understand and it is rare that they are from amongst those who understand the meaning of legislation (*tashree'*). Therefore it is necessary to understand the type of the Legislator's speech before giving the opinion in the type of the hukm shar'i. In other words, it is necessary to understand the meaning of the hadeeth or the ayah in a legislative way, and not only linguistically, so as the Muslim does not fall in the error of prohibiting what Allah (swt) allowed and allow what Allah (swt) prohibited.

The Legislator's speech is understood through the text and the connotations (*qaraa'in*) that determine the meaning of the text. It is not true that every order indicates obligation, and nor does forbiddance indicates prohibition. This is because the order could indicate preference (*nadb*) or allowance (*ibahah*); and forbiddance could also indicate dislike (*karahah*).

When Allah (swt) says:

"Fight against those..." [TMQ At-Tauba:29], He orders with Jihad. The order in this ayah is an obligation (fard), which Allah (swt) persecutes for its negligence. However, the fact that it is an obligation does not come from the order alone. It rather came from other connotations (*qaraa'in*) that indicated this order is a decisive request of doing the action. This connotation is other texts, such as His (swt) saying in another ayah:

"If you do not go forth He will afflict you with a painful doom." [TMQ At-Tauba:39]

And when He (swt) says:

"Do not come close to adultery (zina)." [TMQ Al-Israa:32], He (swt) forbids adultery. The forbiddance in this ayah is prohibition of adultery, which Allah punishes for doing it.

However, the fact that it is haram did not come from the form of forbiddance only. It rather came from other connotations (*qaraa'in*) that indicated this forbiddance is a decisive request of abstaining from the action. This connotation (*qareena*) is other texts, such as His (swt) saying in the same ayah:

"Lo! It is an abomination and an evil way." [TMQ Al-Israa:32]

And His (swt) saying in another ayah:

"The adulterer and the adulteress, lash each one of them with a hundred strikes." [TMQ An-Nur:2]

When Rasool ul-Allah (saw) says:

“The collective prayer (salat ul-Jama’ah) is preferable to the individual prayer with twenty seven degrees.”, he orders with the Jamaa’ah prayer, even though the request did not come in the order form. When he (saw) also says:

“I forbade you from visiting the graves. Look, go visit them.”, he orders with visiting the graves. However, this order or request in these two ahadeeth is mandoob and not fard. The fact that it is mandoob comes from other connotations (*qaraa’in*), such as his (saw) silence (*sukoot*) about some people who prayed individually, and his (saw) silence (*sukoot*) about some people who did not visit the graves. This indicated that it is indecisive request. And when the Rasool (saw) says:

“Who is better off and did not marry, he is not one of us.”

And when we read the forbiddance of the Prophet (saw) from ascetism (*tabattul*), ie from abstaining from marriage in the hadeeth from Samrah:

“The Prophet (saw) forbade from ascetism.”, we find the Rasool (saw) forbids from abstaining from marriage for the better off (rich) person in the first hadeeth, and he forbids from abstaining from the marriage in an absolute way in the second hadeeth. **This does not mean that non marriage in absolute way (the unrestricted not marriage) is haram.** This forbiddance rather indicates that it is disliked (makrooh) and not haram.

The fact that it is only makrooh comes from other connotations (*qaraa’in*), such as the silence (*sukoot*) of the Prophet (saw) from some rich people when he (saw) knew they did not marry, and his (saw) silence from some of the Sahabah when they did not marry.

And when He (swt) says:

“But when you have left the state of pilgrimage, then go hunting (if you will).”

[TMQ Al-Maidah:2]

“If the (Friday) prayer ended, then disperse/walk in the ard (land).”

[TMQ Al-Jumua:10]

He (swt) orders with hunting after dissolving of *ihram* (state of hajj), and orders with disperse (in the land) after the (Friday) prayer. However, this order does not indicate that hunting after dissolving of *ihram* (ritual consecration) is fard and nor it is mandoob; it rather indicates it is mubah. The fact that it is mubah came from another **concatenation (qareenah)**, which is that Allah (swt) ordered with hunting after *ihram* (ritual consecration) where He forbade of it before (starting) *ihram* (ritual consecration). He (swt) also ordered with dispersing (in the land) after the Friday prayer after He forbade of it at the (time of) Friday prayer. That **concatenation (qareenah)** indicated that this order was for *ibahah* (allowance). Thus the hunting in this case and dispersing in that case are mubah.

Therefore, cognizance of the type of the hukm for the text depends on understanding the text in a legislative (*tashree’i*) way, by linking the text with the **concatenations (qaraa’in)** that explains the meaning of the speech in the text. From this, it becomes clear that the ahkam sharee’ah are of many types.

It appears from examining all the texts and all the ahkam that the ahkam sharee’ah are five (types). The fard which means wajib (obligation), the haram which means al-mahdhoor (prohibited), the mandoob, the makrooh and the mubah. This is because the Legislator’s speech, is either a request of (doing) an action, or a request of leaving (an action), or giving choice between doing or leaving. The request (*talab*) might be decisive or indecisive. If the request of doing the action was decisive, then it is the fard. If it was not decisive, then it is the

mandoob (preferable). If the request of abstaining from (the action) was decisive, then it is the haram (prohibited); and if it was indecisive, then it is the makrooh (disliked). The request of (giving) choice is the mubah (allowed).

Thus, the ahkam sharee'ah are only five which are: the fard, the haram, the mandoob, the makrooh and the mubah.

The Opinion deduced by the Mujtahid is a Hukum Shar'i

The job of alienating the Muslims from the restriction with the hukm shar'i takes different styles. One of the most evil styles is what some people claim that the opinions of the Mujtahid Imams, like ash-Shafi'i, Ja'far as-Sadiq or Abu Hanifah are not hukm shar'i but rather opinions (*ra'i*) to them, and it is not necessary to abide by them. They claim that the hukm shar'i is only the Qur'an and the hadeeth. Based on that, the ahkam sharee'ah are confined to what came explicitly in the text, and can be understood from it by nothing more than reading. Accordingly, many new problems, and various incident cases, which did not come in shar'i text, are left without hukm shar'i. So, everybody deals with them according to his own opinion, and his mind controls them, thus giving the solution he sees and the hukm that agrees with his desires. This is, indeed, a manifest sin, a lie against the Islamic sharee'ah, suspension of Ijtihad and turning the people away from the ahkam of Islam. This is because the Kitab and Sunnah are the two source of the Islamic sharee'ah. They came as broadlines and general imports. Their texts came as legislative expressions that indicate on reality and incidents, so they are understood in a legislative way. This adoption is made of their *mantooq*, which is the meaning indicated by the expression; their *mafhoom*, which is the meaning indicated by the meaning of the expression; and their *iqtidaa*; which is the meaning indicated by the *mantooq* and *mafhoon*. These expressions have linguistic meanings and legislative meanings. These sharee'ah texts have other tests from the Kitab and Sunnah which specify them (*takhsees*) in case they are *'aamm* (general); and they restrict them (*taqyeed*) in case they are mutlaq (not restricted). These are also concatenations (*qaraa'in*) which determine their required meaning and the hukm they require, such as the indication of the order as being for obligation (*wujoob*), preference (*nadb*) or allowance (*ibahah*); and the indication of the forbiddance as being for prohibition (*tahreem*) or dislike (*karahah*). The texts can also be specific over an incident or general in everything; beside other matters which the texts of the Qur'an and the hadeeth contain. Therefore, they are understood in a legislative way and not in a literal (*zaahiri*) way or a logical way. That is why difference could happen in understanding the same text, and accordingly two different or opposite opinions could be understood of it. This is in the aspect of the indication of the expression. Moreover, there is also difference over the proof of the hadeeth, in term of its authenticity; thus leading also to difference over accepting or rejecting the hukm deduced from it. It results from all of that the difference in the opinions, whether a particular meaning is the hukm shar'i or it is the opposite or the other meaning. All of these opinions are indicated by the shar'i text, so they are all hukm shar'i, regardless of whether they are variant, different or opposite. This is the hukm shar'i is (the Legislator's speech pertaining to men's actions). The Legislator's speech brought by the *wahy* (revelation) needs to be understood by the one who is addressed with it so as to be a hukm shar'i with his regard. This is because the text needs to be understood so as to act upon it. The Legislator's speech becomes hukm shar'i when it is understood from the indication of the text after the text was proved to be Qur'an or hadeeth. Before the text has been proven and its indication has been understood, it would not be considered a hukm shar'i. Therefore, what made the text a legislator's speech is its understanding. Accordingly, the opinion of the Mujtahid is a hukm shar'i as long as he depends in it on the Kitab and Sunnah, or to any of the adillah sharee'ah (divine evidences) indicated by the Kitab and Sunnah.

Therefore, the opinion of the previous mujtahideen of the authors of the madhahib (schools of thought) and others are ahkam sharee'ah. The opinions of the mujtahideen today are also ahkam sharee'ah, as long as they deduced them through a proper way, depending in them on the adillah sharee'ah. The Prophet (saw) agreed to consider the understanding of the text as

hukm shar'i, and he agreed on the difference in that. This is because after the departure of the confederates in the battle of the trench (ghazwat ul-khandaq), he (saw) ordered somebody to make adhan (announcement) in the people.

“Whoever is hearing and obeying let him not pray the ‘asr (afternoon prayer) except in Bany Quraidhah.”

Some of the people understood refraining from the ‘asr prayer in Madinah, so they did not pray till they reached Bani Quraizah. Some others understood the aim of that is the hurry, so they prayed the ‘asr and marched to Bani Quraizah after performing the ‘asr prayer. They submitted that to the Rasool (saw), so he agreed on both understandings and acknowledged them. The Sahabah (ra) used to differ in understanding the Qur’an and the hadeeth, and they have, in that, different views. Everyone of their opinion is a hukm shar'i, and they unanimously agreed that the opinion understood by any Mujtahid from the text is ahkam shari’.

Thereupon, the Sunnah and *ijmaa’ us-Sahabah* indicate that the opinion deduced by any Mujtahid is considered hukm shar'i which must be restricted to by the one who deduces it, everyone who accepts this understanding or everyone who imitates him in that

The origin, in regards to the actions, is the restriction to the ahkam of Shar’a, and not *Ibahah* (allowance) or *tahreem*.

The mubah is what the textual evidence (*daleel sami’*) indicated of the Legislator’s speech of (giving the) choice, regarding it, between action or abstention without (another) alternative; or it is what the person is given, regarding it, the choice between legally doing it or abstaining from it.

Ibahah is from the ahkam sharee’ah, so the mubah is a hukm shar'i. The hukm shar'i needs an evidence (daleel) to indicate it. Unless there is an evidence to indicate it, it would not be a hukm shar'i. Thus, knowing that the hukm of Allah in the action is mubah needs a daleel shar'i (legal evidence). The absence of the daleel shar'i (legal evidence) does not indicate the action is mubah. This is because the absence of the daleel does not indicate the presence of the *Ibahah hukm* (rule of allowance), and nor the presence of any hukm. It rather indicates of the absence of a hukm to it, and the necessity of seeking for the evidence in order to know the hukm of Allah (swt) on it, so as to decide his position from it. This is because the cognizance of the hukm of the shar'i on the action is obligatory upon every accountable person, in order to decide his position towards the action; whether he undertakes it or abstains from it. *Ibahah* is the Legislator’s speech in giving choice between doing or abstaining. So, unless the Legislator’s speech is known, then the hukm shar'i will not be known; and unless there is a legislator’s speech in giving *ibahah*, then the hukm of *ibahah* will not exist. This is because there is not hukm for the actions of discerning people before the advent of shar'i. Thus the hukm, in terms of the action being mubah, mandoob, fard, makrooh or haram depends on the presence of textual evidence over these ahkam. Without the presence of textual evidence, it is not possible to give the action any of the ahkam. So, we cannot judge of the hukm of *ibahah* (allowance) or *hurmah* (prohibition), or others of the five ahkam, unless there is a textual evidence to indicate that. This does not mean to abstain from seeking the hukm of Allah (swt) about the action, and thus suspending the ahkam of Shar’a or abstaining from discharging the life’s responsibilities, under the pretext of not knowing the rule of Allah (swt) about them. All of that is not allowed by Shar’a. It rather means the action of man needs to know the hukm of Allah (swt) about it, and this necessitates the search for the adillah sharee’ah (legal evidences) and applying them on that action, so that the hukm of Allah (swt) about the action,

is known to be whether it is mubah, haram, fard, makrooh or mandoob. This is because the criterion of actions, in the view of Muslims, is the orders and forbiddings of Allah. Allah (swt) obliged every Muslim to examine every action he approaches it, so as to know the hukm of Allah (swt) about it, before he undertakes it, or whether it is haram, wajib, makrooh, mandoob or mubah. Every action, there is one of the mentioned five rules that pertains to it. So it must be either wajib, haram, mandoob, makrooh or mubah. Every action the Muslim undertakes, he must know the hukm of Allah (swt) regarding it before he acts upon it; this is because Allah will question him about it. Allah (swt) says:

“Then, by your Lord, We shall question every one of what they used to do.”

[TMQ Al-Hijr:92-93]

And He (swt) says:

“And you (Mohammad) are not occupied with any matter, and not recite a lecture from this (scripture) and you (mankind) perform no act, but We are witness of you when you are engaged therein.” [TMQ Yunus:61]

The meaning of that Allah (swt) informs His servants that He is witness of their actions is that He accounts them and questions them about them. The Rasool (saw) has explained the necessity of that action be in accordance of the rules of Islam.

He (saw) said:

“Whoever did an action that is not according to our matter (deen), it is rejected.”

The Sahabah (ra) continued to ask the Rasool ul-Allah (saw) about their actions, so as to know the hukm of Allah about them before they undertook them. **Ibn al-Mubarak narrated from ‘Uthman bin Maz’oon who came to the Prophet (saw) and said, “Do you permit me to be castrated?” The Prophet (saw) said: “No one of us (is allowed to) castrate or be castrated; and the castration of my ummah is fasting (siyam).” He said, “O Rasool ul-Allah, do you allow me to make travel (siyahah) in the land?” He said: “The siyahah (travel) of my Ummah is the Jihad fee sabeeli Allah.” He said, “O Rasool ul-Allah, do you allow monasticism?” He said: “Monasticism of my Ummah is the sitting in the mosques waiting the prayer.”** This is explicit that the Sahabah did not engage in any action except after they asked about it, before undertaking it, so as to know the hukm of Allah (swt) about it. Had the origin of actions been the *ibahah* (allowance), then they would have done it and did not ask about it; and so if Allah (swt) prohibited it they abstained from it, otherwise they would continue on doing it; and they would have not been in need to ask.

As for the silence of the Legislator about some actions, where the hukm of Allah (swt) about them was not shown, though people used to do them; this does not mean that the lack of giving an opinion by the Legislator, whether in word or action is an evidence of allowing the actions which there is not any explicit text about them, whether in word or action. The silence rather means that the actions undertaken before the Rasool (saw), or he knew the people used to do them within the boundary of his authority, is an evidence on allowing these actions only, and not allowing actions absolutely. This is because the silence of Rasool ul-Allah (saw) about the actions, i.e. his acceptance of them, is an evidence of the *ibahah* (allowance) of these actions. This is because the silence about the action is considered of its *ibahah* if that was with his (saw) knowledge, such that it was done before him, or he knew of it. While his (saw) silence about the action, without his knowledge of it, or about the action that took place outside his domain of authority, even if he knew of it, is not called silence that is considered of the *adillah sharee’ah* (legal evidences).

The silence that is considered as a *daleel of ibahah* is the silence of the Rasool (saw) and not, the silence of the Qur’an. This is because Qur’an is the word of Allah (swt); and Allah knows

what was of actions and what is going of them and what will be. The non demonstration of the rule of an action by Qur'an is not considered that it was silent about it. Rather the silence about an action which is considered as a daleel is the silence of the Rasool (saw) about it with his knowledge of it. In other words, the action is done before him, or it is done within the domain of his authority with his knowledge and he remained silent about it.

Some of the Sahabah have considered the *'azl* (discharge of semen outside women's private parts) as allowed because of the silence of the Prophet (saw) about it. So they said, "While Rasool ul-Allah (saw) was amongst us." This is because saying (while the Qur'an was revealed) is an indication of the presence of the Rasool (saw) among them. Some Mujtahids also used, as evidence for allowing eating the lizard meat, the silence of the Prophet about its eating. It was narrated that, "The lizard was eaten at the table (ie before him) of the Prophet and he did not eat from it." So his (saw) silence about the Sahabah while they were eating the lizard at his table (ie before him) is an evidence of allowing eating it. Thus, the silence of the Legislator about the action with its knowledge of it is an evidence of its *ibahah* (allowance). However, the Legislator's non demonstration of the hukm of an action is not an evidence of its *ibahah*. There is a quite difference between the silence and absence of demonstration regarding the indication.

It appears from all of this that the actions of men, in origin have a hukm shar'i, which is required to be sought from the adillah sharee'ah (legal evidences) before undertaking the action. Judgement on the action of being mubah, fard, mandoob, haram or makrooh depends on the knowledge of the textual evidence upon this hukm, from the Kitab, Sunnah, *ijmaa'* or *qiyas*.

The Original Hukm of things is Ibahah

Things are different to the actions. Things are the objects on which man acts in his actions. While the actions are what man undertakes in terms of practical or verbal acts so as to satisfy his needs.

Actions must be related to things used to carry out the action by which man wants to satisfy his needs. Thus, eating, drinking, walking, standing and the like are actions, and practical acts. While trading, hiring, deputation and guarantee and the like are actions and verbal acts. All of these actions, whether practical or verbal, are linked to things inevitably. Eating as it is, is an action; but it is related to bread, apple, ham and others. Drinking, as it is, is an action, but it is linked to water, honey, alcohol and others. These things must need a hukm; and the actions must need a hukm. Do things take the hukm of the action pertaining to them, in terms of obligation, prohibition, preference, dislike or allowance, or they take a hukm different to each action? Or they do not have a hukm, and the hukm is only for the action?

What quickly comes to the mind is that things and actions are the same. The action is not separated from the thing, and the thing is not detached from the action, in terms of consideration. If anyone of them is separated from the other, it would have no consideration. Based on that, it also comes quickly to the mind that the hukm of the action conforms with the hukm of the thing related to that action. Therefore, the scholars, in the declined era, did not differentiate between the thing and the action. So, some of them said the hukm of the things, in origin, is the *ibahah* (allowance), which they considered to include the actions and things. While others said the hukm of the things, in origin, is *tahreem* (prohibition), and they made it to include things and actions.

The truth of the matter is that there is a difference between the actions and things in the Islamic sharee'ah. The one who examines the shar'i texts and the ahkam sharee'ah finds the Shar'a made the rules related to the actions fall within the five rules: *wujoob*, *hurmah*, *nadb*, *karahah* and *ibahah*. So every action can't be other than wajib, haram, mandoob, makrooh or mubah.

The hukm shar'i was defined as being the Legislator's speech related to the actions of men. So the hukm shar'i of the action was decided regardless of the action related to it. Thus the hukm shar'i is for the actions and not for the things. The Legislator allowed trading as trading. Allah (swt) says:

"Allah made the bai' (trading) halal." [TMQ Al-Baqarah:275]

As for the things related to the trading, some of them Allah (swt) allowed it such as the grapes, while He (swt) prohibited some others, like alcohol. The hukm of *ibahah* is for the action of trading, and the prohibition is for the action of usury (riba), regardless of the things connected with the action. While the one who examines the shar'i texts regarding the things, he finds Allah (swt) gave the things the description of halal or haram only. He did not give them the hukm of *wujoob*, *nadb* or *karahah*. He (swt) made halal and haram a description for the things. Allah (swt) says:

"Say, 'Have you considered what provision Allah has sent down for you, how you have made of it lawful and unlawful?'" [TMQ Yunus:59]

"And do not speak concerning that which your own tongues qualify falsely as lawful or unlawful." [TMQ An-Nahl:116]

"Indeed He made the carrion unlawful to you." [TMQ Al-Baqarah:173]

"We forbade every animal with claws." [TMQ Al-Anam:146]

“And he makes the unclean (khaba’ith) haram on you.” [TMQ Al-Araf:157]
“Why do you make haram (unlawful) that which Allah made lawful to you.”
[TMQ At-Tahrim:1]

So, all the texts did not give the thing except one description out of two: either it is halal or it is haram, and there is no third one, nor is it other than one of these two. This matter of allowing (making things halal) or prohibition (making things haram) is only for Allah (swt) alone. Nobody else has a right to associate with him in that. Any one who gives an opinion of his own accord is sinful, transgressor and lies on Allah (swt). Allowance (being halal) and prohibition (being haram) are two descriptions, that one of them is necessary to everything Allah (swt) created of the tangible objects. Whether it is used to eat, dress, ride, dwell in, used or not used. If we examine the divine texts (*an-nusoos ash-sharee’ah*), we find Allah (swt) had the origin of all these objects to be halal (allowed). He (swt) permitted us to use all that man can reach to. He (swt) excluded of this general allowance some objects He (swt) mentioned by name and prohibited them.

This allowance (*ibahah*) is understood from the sharee’ah texts in a summary and general form. We find the texts sum the allowance (*ibahah*) in the like of His (swt) saying:

“It is He Who created for you all that is in the earth.” [TMQ Al-Baqarah:29]

The texts generalise the allowance (*ibahah*), like in His (swt) saying:

“Do you not see how Allah has made serviceable to you whatsoever is in the skies and whatsoever is in the earth, and He has loaded you with His favours, both the open and the hidden.” [TMQ Luqman:20]

He (swt) also sums and details like in His (swt) saying:

“Who has appointed the earth a resting-place for you, and the sky a canopy; and caused water to pour down from the sky, thereby producing fruits as food for you.” [TMQ Al-Baqarah:22]

“And He made the ships to be of service to you, that they may run upon the sea at His command, and had made of service to you the rivers. And made the sun and the moon constant in their courses, to be of service to you and had made of service to you the night and the day. And He gives you of all you ask of Him; and if you would count the bounty of Allah, you can’t reckon it.” [TMQ Ibrahim:32-34]

“And We send down from the sky blessed water whereby We give growth to gardens and the grain of crops. And lofty date palms with ranged clusters. Provision (made) for men...”
[TMQ Qaf:9-11]

“Say: Who has forbidden the adornment of Allah which He has brought forth, for His bondment, and the good things of this provision...” [TMQ Al-Araf:32]

“He has forbidden you only carrion and blood and swine flesh and that which has been immolated to (the name of) any other than Allah.” [TMQ Al-Baqarah:173]

“Say: I find not in that which is revealed to me anything prohibited to the eater that he eats except it be carrion, or blood poured forth...” [TMQ Al-Anam:145]

These ayah indicate that Allah (swt) allowed all things (objects) for man; and what He (swt) prohibited of them He (swt) excluded them and stated them alone. The hadeeth stated also some of the prohibited things. It was reported that the Prophet (saw) forbade eating the domestic asses, every beast that has canine teeth and every bird that has claws.

The Lawgiver allowed all the things, meaning that He (swt) made them halal. For allowance in regards to the things means the halal, which is opposite to the haram. When it sates upon

the prohibition (*hurmah*) of some of them he excludes these things only. Thus allowance (*ibahah*) and prohibition (*humrah*) in regards to the things is description of them. Things have no other divine description. So the allowance of a thing; object, ie, being halal, does not need an evidence. This is because the general (‘*aamm*’) evidence (daleel) in the texts (*nusoos*) allowed (made halal) all the things. As for the prohibitions (*humrah*) of a things it needs an evidence; because it is excluded and specified from the general evidences of allowance (*ibahah*), so it requires an evidence. Thus, the origin in the things is the allowance (*ibahah*). In other words, the origin in them that they are halal.

It is not allowed that the Ahkam (rules) change as the time and place change.

It dominates over the minds of the majority of Muslims nowadays a belief that Islam is flexible; and it adapts with the social, economical and political situations in every time and every place; and that it changes to comply with, in terms of its ahkam (rules), the needs of the recent situations, and with the requirements of what the people, nowadays, liked and used to.

They support this claim they advocated by a principle (*qaa'idah*) they describe as legal (*shar'i*) which says:

“There is no obligation that the ahkam (rules) change as the time changes.” Based on that, you find them adjust their conduct with the reality (*al-waaq'i*) and adapt their behaviour in accordance with what is requires. If you reminded them with the ahkam of the Shar'a, they said they (the ahkam) were for a specific time; and Islam obliges men to go along with his time; and to act in accordance with what suits his time and place!! So, they justify the presence of banks based on interest (usury) and the share companies and dealing with them as a practical interest (*maslahah*). So Islam must be twisted to as to agree on them, for it is flexible as they forge. Women's show-off their charm, and their mixing with others without a need approved by Shar'a, and their entertainment with the foreigner men in the (night) parties; all of these must be permitted and accepted, because they are the time necessities. How then Islam disagrees with the age when the divine principle says: Islam changes as the time and place change? That is what they claim. They also say polygamy has finished as a rule because the time no more finds it pleasant. Similarly amputating the thief's hand and stoning the adulterer or lashing him must not be discussed, because they do not suit the taste of our current time. Thus, the principle and its examples proceed so as to be concentrated in the minds of the Muslims. This is at the time they totally disagree with Islam; they rather destroy its principles and details, demolish its legislation and obliterate its features. These ideas appeared only at the end of the nineteenth century, at the time of the worst intellectual decline. Imperialism came later on to nurture this concept till it prevailed in this harsh form.

Ahkam sharee'ah in Islam came as systems to treat man in regards the satisfaction of his organic needs and instincts. The Legislator has addressed us with these ahkam in the Kitab and the Sunnah, which are the only source in Islam for deducting the ahkam sharee'ah. The hukm shar'i is the Legislator's speech related to the action of men. This hukm shar'i must be proved by an evidence (daleel) that it is the speech of the Legislator. In other words, it must be derived from the text, which is the ayah or the hadeeth; or what is proved by the test, such as *ijmaa' us-Sahabah* and the *qiyas* (analogy) based on a divine reason (*'illah sharee'ah*). Accordingly, there is only one source for the ahkam sharee'ah, that is the Book of Allah and the Sunnah of His Messenger (saw). From these two sources, the treatments are deduced for solving the problems of people and settling the disputes amongst them. So, are the time and place considered Book or Sunnah? On what basis man is allowed to treat his problems, and the Ummah to organise the relationships of her society, according to the time and place, when Allah (swt) has obliged that the reality be treated by the ahkam deduced from the Kitab of Allah and the Sunnah of His Messenger (saw)?

When the Islamic sharee'ah treats man, it requires studying the reality of his problems, then discovering the hukm of Allah (swt) on them, by deducing it from the Kitab and the Sunnah, or from what they alluded to. So it is a duty upon every Muslim, when he applies the sharee'ah on the society, to study the society accurately, and then treat it by the Shar'a of Allah (swt) and change it radically based on the ideology of Islam, without giving any account to the circumstances and situations in disagreeing with the Shar'a. So everything that disagrees with

Islam must be removed; and everything Islam commanded of must be enforced and put in application. The reality of the society must be restricted with the orders and prohibitions of Allah (swt). It is not allowed for Muslims to adjust in accordance with the reality of their time and place. It is rather duty upon them to treat that with the Book of Allah and the Sunnah of His Messenger.

The Order (amr) and the form of Imperative

Muslims are obliged, in this life, to proceed in accordance with the orders and prohibitions of Allah. His (swt) orders and prohibitions came at the tongue of Rasool ul-Allah Muhammad (saw) in the Book and the Sunnah. From these two sources we derive the ahkam and what can be evidences with them, for the ahkam, which are *ijmaa' us-Sahabah* and the *qiyas* (analogy).

These ahkam are erived from the orders and prohibitions that came in the Book and the Sunnah. The orders and prohibitions that came in the Book and Sunnah are not confined to the form of the imperative (*seeghat fi'lul amr*).

They rather came in many forms. Therefore, it is wrong to think that the meaning of the order of Allah (swt) that He orders of a thing by the form do (*if'al*). He might rather order with the imperative form (do) as well as with other forms.

When Allah (swt) says:

“Fasting has been prescribed upon you.” [TMQ Al-Baqarah:183], He orders with fasting.

And when He (swt) says:

“It is duty upon (Muslim) people to make pilgrimage (Hajj) to the House.” [TMQ Al-Imran:97], He orders with Hajj. He (swt) also orders with the form of imperative (*seeghat ul-amr*) as in His (swt) saying:

“Establish the prayer.” [TMQ Al-Baqarah:43], and

“When you contract a debt for a fixed time, record it in writing.”

[TMQ Al-Baqarah:282]

So the order from Allah (swt) is the request from us to do the matter, whether He (swt) ordered of it in the imperative form or information form.

It is incorrect to say this matter is not obligatory (*wajib*), because there is not a text that orders us of it, for there is no imperative form and it came in the informative form. Nor it is correct to say this matter is obligatory (*wajib*) because it came in the imperative form. This is because the matter might be obligatory and it came in other than the imperative form; and it might be not obligatory and it came in the imperative form. Since what is meant by the order (*amr*) is the request of (doing) the matter regardless of the form in which the request came; for there is no specific form for the order.

As regards to the form of do (*if'al*), it is not specific to the order alone. It is rather common (*mushtarak*) for the order (*amr*) and others. It might be for warning (*tahdeed*) direction (*irshad*) and allowance (*ibahah*); and all of these are not orders. The common (*mushtarak*) word, in the language, that has many meanings, is suitable for all the meanings it indicates in the language if it came detached for *qaraa'in* (connections). It is not assigned to a specific meaning unless there is a *qareenah* (connection) which indicates that.

As an example, the word ‘*al-‘ayn*’ is a word common (*mushtarak*) between many meanings. It is called upon ‘*al-‘ayn*’ (the eye), ‘*al-jasoos*’ (spy), ‘*al-‘ayn al-jariyah*’ (fountain), and ‘*annaqd*’ (currency). There is no preference of any of these meanings over the others with a *qareenah* (connection), for it represents the true (*haqeeqi*) in some of them and metaphoric (*majazi*) in others.

Likewise the form (*seeghah*) of do (*if'al*) is a common (*mushtarak*) between many meanings. It is called to mean the order (*amr*), to mean giving choice (*takhyeer*), to mean threatening (*tahdeed*) and to mean gratitude (*imtinan*). Not any one of these meanings is preferred to the others without a *qareerah* (linkage). This is because it represents the true meaning of each one of them; and it is not true (*haqeeqi*) in some of them and metaphoric (*majazi*) in the others. The Qur'an has come with these meanings (for the *amr*) in many explicit ayah that are not subject for interpretation (*ta'weel*).

It appears for examining the ayah that came with the imperative form (*seeghatul amr*) that the Qur'an called it in different accounts and did not specify it with the order. It came to mean obligation (*wujoob*) as in His (swt) saying:

"Establish the prayer." [TMQ Al-Israa:78]

It also means preference (*nadb*) as in His (swt) saying:

"... write for them..." [TMQ An-Nur:33]

It means direction (*irshad*) as in His saying:

"... so seek witness..." [TMQ Al-Baqarah:282]

Which means if you wanted to conclude a transaction, it is more convenient that you have witnesses on it so that your right is not lost. It is for allowance (*ibahah*), such as His (swt) saying:

"...But when you have left the sacred territory, then go hunting (if you will)..."

[TMQ Al-Maidah:2]

And His (swt) saying:

"And when the prayer is ended, then disperse in the land..." [TMQ Al-Jumua:10]

It is also for gratitude (*imtinan*) as His (swt) saying:

"Eat of what Allah provided to you." [TMQ Al-Anam:42]

It is for honouring (*ikram*) as His (swt) saying:

"Enter them (the gardens) in peace, secure." [TMQ Al-Hijr:46]

It is for threatening (*tahdeed*) as His (swt) saying:

"Do what you like." [TMQ Fussilat:40]

And:

"Take your ease (enjoy yourselves) a while." [TMQ Az-Zariyat:43]

It is for mockery (*tashkeer*) as His (swt) saying:

"Be you apes, despised and hated!" [TMQ Al-Baqarah:65]

It is for incapacitation (*ta'jeez*) as His (swt) saying:

"Be you stones or iron. Or some created thing that is yet greater in your thoughts!" [TMQ Al-Israa:50-51]

It is for humiliation (*ihanah*) as His (swt) saying:

"Taste! Lo! You are might, full of honour." [TMQ Ad-Dukhan:49]

It is as well for equalization (*taswiyah*) as His (swt) saying:

"Be patient or don't be..." [TMQ At-Tur:16]

Thus the imperative form (*seeghatul amr*) carries many meanings. If it came free of the *qaraa'in* (connections), then it is necessary to seek for the *qareenah* (linkage) in the text it came in or in other texts that came in the same subject or case, in order to assign what is meant of the command in that text. In other words, this is to determine the intended meaning of the imperative form in the text.

In this manner, it becomes possible to understand the divine text (*an-nuss ash-shar'i*), and to derive the hukm of Allah (swt) meant from that text. Thus man would follow the halal as it came and not as what the person wishes. He avoids the haram that came and not what the

person himself views. In such a way man would have followed the halal and avoided the haram in the manner which Allah (swt) wanted.

Maslaha (interest) exists wherever Shar'a exists

Allah (swt) says in His Book addressing the Rasool (saw):

"We did not send you save a mercy for the peoples." [TMQ Al-Anbiaa:107]

The fact that he came as a mercy for them means that he brought what is of their interest (*maslahah*). He (swt) says:

"O Mankind! There has come to you an exhortation from your Lord, a cure for that which is in the breasts, a guidance and a mercy, for believers." [TMQ Yunus:57]

And He (swt) says:

"Now has there come to you a clear proof from your Lord, a guidance and a mercy." [TMQ Al-Anam:157]

The guidance and mercy are either for bringing about a benefit (*manfa'ah*) to the people or for removing away a harm (*mafsadah*) from them. This is the interest (*maslahah*). This is because the *maslahah* is bringing about the *manafi'* (benefits) and removing away the *mafasid* (evils). The function of determining that a (certain) matter is *maslahah* or not is for the Shar'a only; for it is the one that came with the *maslahah*, and it is the one which defines this *maslahah* for mankind. This is because what is meant by the *maslahah* is the *maslahah* of man as a human being. Even what is meant by the *maslahah* of the individual is his *maslahah* as a human being and not only as a particular individual. However, the *maslahah* is either decided by the mind ('aql) or the Shar'a. If its consideration was left to the 'aql, the people will be unable to define the true *maslahah*. This is because the 'aql is limited, so it can't encompass the nature and reality of man, so it would not be able to decide what is of *maslahah* to him, for it did not comprehend the reality of man in order to decide whether this matter is of *maslahah* or *mafsadah* (evil) to him. It is only the Creator of man who understands the reality of man. Thus, no one other than the Creator of man, Allah (swt), that can certainly decide what is *maslahah* and what is *mafsadah* (evil) for him. It is true that man can think that matter is good or bad (*maslahah* or *mafsadah*) for him, but he can't be sure of that. So leaving the decision of the *maslahah* to the speculation (dhann) would lead to fall in dangers. This is because he might think of a matter to be *maslahah*, then it appears to be *mafsadah*. In such a case he decided the *mafsadah* (bad) for man as being *maslahah*, thus causing harm to him. A matter could also appear to be *mafsadah*, then it is discovered to be *maslahah*. So he would remove a *maslahah* from man, thinking it is *mafsadah*, thus causing harm to him by depriving him of a *maslahah*. Moreover, 'aql might judge on a matter to be *maslahah*, today, then man himself discovers tomorrow that thing is *mafsadah*, so he judges on it to be *mafsadah*. The same thing could occur to the *mafsadah* also, where he says about a thing to be *mafsadah* today, then he himself discovers tomorrow that it is *maslahah* and thus says it is *maslahah*. Thus the thing itself becomes *maslahah* and *mafsadah*, a matter which is not allowed, nor it can be so. For, a matter is either *maslahah* or *mafsadah* in the same case. Leaving the decision to the 'aql, the *maslahah* becomes relative and not real.

Therefore, 'aql must not be left to decide what is the *maslahah*. This must rather be left to the Shar'a alone to decide. For it is the one that decides the real *maslahah* and the real *mafsadah*. The 'aql only understands the reality (*waaqi'*) of the matter in a perfect way, then it understands the divine text that came about that matter, then it applies the text on the reality.

If it applied to it, then it would be a *maslahah* or a *mafsadah* according to the text of the Shar'a. If it did not apply to it, then the meaning that applies to the reality has to be sought for, so as the *maslahah* that Shar'a decided can be known, through the knowledge of the hukm of Allah (swt) in that matter.

Thus, *maslahah* is a shar'i one and not 'aqli. It goes along with the Shar'a. Thus, the *maslahah* exists wherever the Shar'a exists, because the Shar'a decides *masalih* of men.

Rules (Ahkam) or Worships ('Ibadat) are Tawqifi

'Ibadat are the ultimate degree of sanctification (*taqdees*). It is innate (*fitri*) in man, for it is the response, to the instinct of religiousness (*tadayyun*). 'Aql is associated with the emotion (*shu'oor*) in that so as man worships the one worthy of worship, who is the Creator. This is in order that *wijdan* (sentiment) does not go astray by worshipping that which is not worthy of 'ibadah (worship), or it mistakes by seeking nearness from the worshipped (thing) with that which distances him from it. Thus the role of the 'aql in the 'ibadah is inevitable in discovering what is worshipped and defining it, which is the Creator.

As for the manner by which the creature performs the 'ibadah to the Creator, the 'aql has no role in it, nor it can know it. This is because this manner is the ahkam in accordance of which man worships Allah (swt). In other words it is a system that organises the relationship of the creature with the Creator, ie, the one who worships with the One who is worshipped. This system can't come from the creature at all. This is because the creature can't comprehend the reality of the Creator so as to organise his relationship with Him. Nor he knows His essence so as to know he worships Him. Thus, it is impossible that man can place, by his 'aql, a system for 'ibadat between him and the Creator, by which he organises his relation with the Creator, ie he organises his sanctification (*taqdees*) to the Creator. This is because putting this organisation requires comprehending the reality of the Creator, a matter that is impossible. Then it becomes impossible for man to put down, by his 'aql, the ahkam of 'ibadat. Thereupon, the system of 'ibadat must come from the creator, and not from the created, ie, it should come from the worshipped, and not from the worshipper. Thus, it is necessary that the rules of 'ibadat must come from Allah (swt) alone, and not from man. Man has no role whatsoever in that, whatever little it might be, because it is impossible for him to put it.

This system must be conveyed from the Creator to the created, so as he worships the god in accordance with it. Thereupon, it is inevitable that there is a need for messengers to convey to people the ahkam of 'ibadat; for it is impossible that people put down ahkam in 'ibadat, and because they do not come except from Allah (swt).

It might be said there is no need for man to have a system of 'ibadat; he can rather perform the 'ibadat without a system. For they are the ultimate degrees of sanctification, so man undertakes the 'ibadah the way he likes, because it is a response to satisfy the instinct of religiousness; which needs satisfaction only. So he satisfies it by any action of sanctification that leads to this satisfaction. What is the need to organise the sanctification, ie, the need for ahkam to 'ibadat? The answer to that is that the response of any instinct necessitates organising the actions that achieve this response. This is because the absence of their organisation would lead to anarchy, which would lead to the wrong or the abnormal satisfaction; where both of these contradicts the origin upon which the instinct is built. So if the reproduction instinct required sexual satisfaction while it has no system for this satisfaction, it would try to satisfy it with anything that achieves it. This would lead it either to the abnormal satisfaction or a party which is not a place for satisfaction. This means the destruction of the human kind for which the instinct existed; or to the wrong satisfaction, which is the satisfaction of a party which is the place of satisfaction, but only for the temporary satisfaction. This also leads to deviate from the result of the satisfaction which is giving birth, thus leading to reduce the offspring if not even stopping it. This again deviates the instinct from the purpose it existed for, which is the continuation of the human race.

Therefore, it is necessary there should be a system that regulates the reproduction instinct.

For the religiousness instinct, it is also necessary to organise the actions that performs the response of sanctification. In other words, it is necessary, to organise the sanctification, which is the 'ibadah. This is because the absence of its organisation leads to that man undertakes any action that performs sanctification. This would lead to the abnormal satisfaction by sanctifying a party that is not the place of sanctification, such as sanctifying the five as being a god, or sanctifying an idol made of dates, where man makes with his hand, worships it and then eats it. This deviates the instinct by making it sanctify other than the Creator, though the instinct is the feeling of deficiency and need to the Creator, the Sustainer. Thus, the sanctification becomes contradictory to the instinct that incites it. It might also lead to sanctify a party which is the place of sanctification, but only for the sake of satisfaction, and not for examining its reality. This is like the sanctification of an idol presuming that the god is incarnated in him near to Allah (swt). This would mean deviation of *shukr* (gratefulness) to the One who deserves thanking and praise, by performing this praise to other than who deserves it, that is the idol. This deviates the instinct away from what it existed for, that is the sanctification of the Creator, the Sustainer.

Therefore, there must be a system that organises the religiousness instinct as well as the reproduction instinct. The difference between the two instincts is that the reproduction instinct, man can put a system from his 'aql for the actions that achieve its response, because they are from the relations of man with another man. He can comprehend man and organise his relationship with him; though it can't be a perfect system. As for the religiousness instinct, he can't place by his 'aql a system for the actions that performs its response. This is because it is a relationship of man with his Creator and Sustainer. He can't comprehend Him, so he can't organise his relationship with Him. Rather, this system must come from the Creator.

Thus the ahkam of 'ibadat must come from the Creator and not from the created.

Thought (Fikr)

Thought (*fikr*), comprehension (*idrak*) and mind (‘aql), all have the same meaning. They are various names to the same meaning. Thought (*fikr*) is also called to thinking (*tafkeer*), ie, the thinking process. It might also be called to mean the result of thinking, ie, what man arrives at from the intellectual process. Thought, that means thinking, has no organ (in the body) specific to it, so as to point out to it. It is rather a complicated process that consists of the tangible reality (*waaqi’ mahsoos*), the sensation (*ihsas*) of man, his brain and the previous information he has. Unless these four matters come together in a specific process, then neither thought, comprehension nor minds (‘aql) can take place.

Therefore, the previous people were mistaken when they discussed ‘aql; and they started trying to locate its place in the head, the heart or otherwise. It appears they thought the mind is a specific organ; or the mind (‘aql) has a specific organ. The modern time people were mistaken when they made the brain the place of ‘aql, *idrak* and *fikr*; whether those who said thought is the reflection of the brain on the reality, or those who said the thought is the reflection of reality on the brain. This is because the brain is an organ like the other organs, from which no reflection can take place, nor any reflection can take place on it. For reflection is placing a light on an object and its retreat from it, or improving the object on a body that has the capacity of reflection and its retreat from it, with the existence of light. This is like flashing an electric light on a body then the retreat of the light from the body. Thus the body is seen as well as the light. Or imposing the sun, moon or any light from anywhere. This is also similar to impose a body on a mirror and also the image of the body retreats from the mirror, so the body is seen as it is. The image of the body retreats as if it is drawn behind the mirror, thus it is seen. In fact it was not drawn, it rather reflected like the light reflects on any body. This is the reflection. In the thinking process, no reflection takes place. There is no reflection from the brain on the reality, nor from the reality on the brain. Thus, reflection, as it is, did not occur. As for the eye, which is alluded that reflection takes place by means of it, this does not occur, neither in it nor from it. What actually takes place is refraction. The observed thing, its image does not retract outside (the eye). What rather takes place is refraction from its imposition on the eye. Where the image of the observed object refracts (in the eye) and settles inside, so the object is seen. The image does not retract back, so it is not possible that reflection ever occurs from it or with it. Therefore, brain is not the place of thought.

What takes place is that the image of the revised object transfers to the brain by the means of the senses. This image would be in accordance of the sense that carried the object. If the sense is the sight it transfers the image of the object. If it is the hearing it transfers the image of its sound. If it is smelling it transfers the image of its smell, and so on. Thus the object is drawn, as it is transferred, in the brain, ie, in accordance with the transferred image. Then what occurs is only sensation of the reality, but no thinking takes place. Instinctive comprehension only takes place in terms of the fact that it satisfies or not, hurts or not, places or not and tastes well or not. Nothing more occurs, so thinking does not take place. **If however, there were previous information, by are connected, by the means of the faculty of linkage present in the brain, with the sensed reality that was drawn in the brain.** Thus, a thinking process takes place, and from that, comprehending the (sensed) matter results, and its identity is known. If there were no previous information, then it is not possible to comprehend the reality of the (sensed) matter. It rather remains at the limit of sensation only, or the instinctive identification only, in terms of the fact that it satisfies or not, and nothing more. No thought at all takes place in that case.

Thereupon, the thinking process does not take place except with the presence of four matters: the second reality, the senses or one of them, the brain and the previous information. If any one of these four was lacking, then it is not possible at all for thought to take place. What occurs, in terms of thinking trials, in the absence of the sensed reality and the absence of previous information, are only useless fantasies and they are not thoughts. Submitting oneself to them, by distancing oneself from the sensed reality (*waqi'*) or from the previous information related to that reality leads to excessive indulgence in delusion and misguidance. It might even lead to the overexertion of the brain, thus it becomes afflicted with disease of disturbance, epilepsy and the like. Therefore, there must exist the sensed reality, the previous information, the brain and the senses.

Therefore, thought, comprehension or mind is the transferring of the reality to the brain by the senses, together with previous information by which this reality is understood. It is said transferring the reality, rather than transferring the image of the reality. This is because what is transferred is the sensation of the reality not an image like the photo. It is this image of the reality and it is the reality as sensation. Therefore, saying it is transferring the reality is more precise than saying transferring the image of the reality. This is because the transferred image is sensation of the reality and not only an image of it.

This is the definition of the thought. In other words, this is the thought, comprehension or mind ('aql). This process occurs in the thinking who produces the thought, and not in the one to whom the thought is transferred. In regards to the one to whom the thought is transferred, this process does not take place, because the thought resulted and finished. Thus the one who produces it, he gives it to the people; and the people give it to each other; and they express it in terms of the language or others, though expressing it by language is prevailing all over the world.

The thought carried to a person is examined. If it has a sensed reality, which the person sensed before, or he sensed which it was transferred to him, or he did not sense before, or he did not sense it when it was transferred to him, but he rather conceived in his mind as it was carried to him and he tasted it, and because to have a reality in his mind as if he sensed it and accepted it like his acceptance with the sensed reality. In both these two cases, he would have comprehended it, and by the presence of this reality of the thought in his mind it would become one of his concepts, and it would become a true thought as if it resulted from him. If this thought had no reality in the person to who it was carried, but he rather understood the sentence, and understood the thought and understood what is meant by it, without a reality of it being formed in his mind, rather by sensation, a trust or acceptance, then it is only information, ie, only information about matters. It is thus a thought in terms of what it indicates. It is however only information with the one who does not have a reality about it in his mind. Therefore, information do not have influence on the people. Rather the concepts have, for they are thoughts that have reality in the mind of the one who comprehended them. Thus, it is necessary to understand the nature of the thought, so as to know how the thought can have influence.

Method of Thinking

Thought arises in man from the linkage in him of the reality (*waqi'*) with previous information about it. It never arises from the reality alone and nor from the information alone, whatsoever.

If you placed before a child objects he did not know before, and examined if thoughts occurs in him, you find that from the repetition of his sensation of the reality alone, that it occurs with him sensation of the presence of the reality, and he can distinguish the objects from each other. He can distinguish what hurts and what pleases, what delights and what annoys or what satisfies and the like, which are connected with the instincts or the transgenic needs. Nothing more than that occurs with him, no matter how much the sensation differed, repeated or varied. Thus, sensation occurs with him, and from this sensation and its repetition, only instinctive identification occurs. However, if you placed an object before him and then you linked it with information about it, he would comprehend what it is. If you asked him about it, he would explain it to you, and explained to you what it is. Thus, the comprehension of the object occur then with him, ie, there becomes thought with him. If you gave him only information about the object, and repeated these information, he would tell these information as they are; and no thought will occur with him unless he links them with the reality. The tangible evidence on that is the following: put before a child a balance, an apple and a piece of fire, then give him information about each one of them by saying to him, for example: A balance that weighs, an apple that is eaten and fire that burns. Repeat these many times to him, then ask him: Where is the balance? He would point to the apple or the fire. He might also point to the balance, but if he noticed that you are not satisfied, he would change immediately and point to another thing. This is because he received information and repeated them. But no thought occurred with him. However, if you showed him the balance, and told him that this balance weighs, and explained to him the process of weighing and repeated that. Then you showed him the apple and the fire, and repeated the same, there will then be thought with him. If you said to him where is the balance, he would point to it and direct you to it. If you rejected that and tried to deceive him, he would not accept from you, and insist on the balance that was explained to him because he understood it. So he would be able to know once he saw it or its name was mentioned to him. This is because he got thought about these objects through the linkage of the reality with the information.

Thus, thought arises in man from his sensation of the reality together with receiving from somebody else information together with the sensation. Thus, he would have thought due to that. This is in case he did not have information. If, however, he had information, then thought would have taken place with him before. If he wanted to initiate a new thought about a matter, then he senses the reality, and then connects his sensation of the reality with his previous information, and thus issues a thought. If he had no any information related to this object, he would not be able to think of it until he receives information about it; then from receiving the information together with his sensation of the reality, a new thought emerges with him. In this way, thought develops.

This development (of thought) is the natural method of thinking with man, and it is the basic method of thinking, and it is the one that imitates thought.

Therefore, the method of thinking as such, necessitates the linkage of the sensation of the reality with the previous information about it, or the linkage of the information with the sensation of the reality; then thought takes place. Without that there will never be thought. So

it is necessary to provide the information together with the sensation of the reality so as to initiate thought. There must exist sensation of the reality together with the information that are provided if it is wished to understand the thought that is given. There must exist a sensed reality and information so as thought to exist. This alone is the method of thinking. Therefore, giving the information alone, and their linkage together without being connected with a sensed reality does not contribute thought with the person. This rather initiates information with him, and there exists no thought no matter how much you discussed to him, unless he realises their reality, and that reality be sensed to him.

This is in regards to initiating thought in the thinker who initiated or developed the thought. This is also the case with the one who gives thought to others. If it is wished to give this thought to the people, it is possible to be carried to them by any of the means of expression, such as the language. If this thought is connected in them with a reality they sensed before, or they sensed of something like it or close to it, then it would have been carried to them as thought. It would then become one of their concepts which they themselves reached to. If it was not connected in them with a reality sensed to them, such that they understood the meaning of the sentences which they were explained to them, without conceiving any reality to them, then it would not have been carried to them as thought. It was rather carried to them as information only. With such information, they would become educated, and not thinkers. This is because it was not carried to them as thought, but rather as sentences that contain information. Therefore, it is necessary that those who carry thoughts to the people they have to bring the meanings in these thoughts closer to the minds of the people, by trying to link them with their reality that sensed by them, or with a reality close to what they sense, in order that they take these thoughts from them as thoughts. If they did not do so, they would have not then carried their thoughts to the people. They rather carried to them information that they taught them with.

Therefore, it is necessary to endeavour in having thinking method, by linking the information with the reality at the time of developing thought; or by bringing the thoughts closer to the sensed reality in the one who takes them, so as the information are linked with the reality, thus initiating thought.

Thereupon, discovering the method of thinking and the care of it are of the most important matters that must exist with the people.

Al-qadriyyah a-ghaybiyyah (Fatalism)

Al-qadariyyah al-ghaybiyyah is to surrender to the destiny (*qadar*); and to refer everything to the actions of fate hidden from man; and that activity of man in life has no effect; he is rather compelled and not of free will; he is like the feather in space where the winds move it wherever they like.

This idea has spread, and taken as an ‘aqeedah, since the late times of the Abbasid era, and continued till today. The obligation of belief in *al-qadhaa’ wal-qadar* was used as a means by which this idea was introduced to Muslims. Because of it, the failing people found under its cover a pretext for their failure. The ignorant and inactive people found in their reference to it an excuse for their laziness and reluctance. Many people consented for the injustice to befall them; the poverty to eat their flesh; the disgrace to reign at them, and the sins prevail on their actions. All of this is in surrender from their side to *al-qadariyyah al-ghaybiyyah* which they believe in, claiming that this is a submission to *al-qadaa’ wal-qadar* of Allah (swt).

This idea still dominates the people, has control on many of their actions. Though, the one who studies and scrutinizes the matter finds that *al-qadariyyah al-ghaybiyyah* was not known at the time of the Sahabah, nor it came to the mind of anyone of them. Had it existed with the Muslims, they would have not made conquests, nor endured the difficulties. They would have rather left the *qadar* to do whatever it likes, and would have said: “whatever is destined till take place, whether you strove for it or not!” However, there knowledgeable Muslims realised: the castle cannot be conquered without the sword (force); the enemy cannot be subjugated without the force; that rizq (provision) must be sought; the disease must be averted from it; the Muslim who drinks alcohol must be lashed; and the thief’s hand must be amputated; the ruler must be accounted; and the political manoeuvres must be carried out with the enemies. Muslims did not believe in that, when they saw the Muslims’ army under the leadership of the Rasool (saw), his archers violated the orders of the leadership. They saw the army win at Hunayn after the defeat, because the army which fled from the battle in fear of the arrows returned to the fight when the Rasool (saw) called on it, while he (saw) and a few people remained steadfast in the battle, before the eyes of the fleeing army.

Allah (swt) taught us to link between the causes and the effects (*al-asbab wal-musabbabat*). He (swy) made the cause produce the effect. The fire burns, and no burning occurs without fire. The knife cuts, and no cut occurs without a knife. He (swt) created man, and He (swt) made in him the capability to carry out an action. He (swt) gave him the full choice to carry out his actions; he eats the time he wishes; he walks when he wishes; he travels when he wishes. He seeks knowledge so he becomes learned; he murders so he is punished; he abandons Jihad so he becomes humiliated; and he refrains from striving for provision (rizq) so he becomes poor. So there is no presence to *al-qadariyyah al-ghaybiyyah* in the life reality, and nor in the Shar’a of Allah (swt).

As regards to *al-qadaa’ wal-qadar*, they have nothing to do with *al-qadariyyah al-ghaybiyyah*, whatsoever. This is because *al-qadaa’* is the action that occur from man and on him, without his will. This is like seeing with his eyes and not with his nose; he hears with his ears and not with his mouth; and he has no control over the beats of his heart. This is like a storm from the sky or an earthquake, from which a person falls from the roof of a house over another person, thus killing him. All of such actions enter in the *qadhaa’*; and man is not accounted for them. These actions have nothing to do with the freewill actions of man.

While *al-qadar* is the attributes of things by which a matter results, such as burning in the fire, predestined cutting in the knife; the predestined reproduction instinct in man. All of these attributes (in things) can't carry out an action without a perpetrator. If a man exercised an action using them (the objects) by his choice, he would be the perpetrator and not the *qadar* present in the object. So if a person burnt a house using fire, he would be the one who made the burning and not the fire which burns by the attribute predestined in it. Thus man is accounted for the action of burning he did. This is because he is the one who exercised a specific action, by his own choice, using the *qadar*. So *al-qadar* does not produce a matter without an action of a perpetrator. *Al-qadhaa'* has no relation with the actions of man which he performs by his choice. Thus, both *al-qadhaa'* and *al-qadar* have no relation with the free actions of man. They also have relation with the universal law in terms of controlling it. They are rather part of the universal law which proceeds according to the laws which Allah (swt) exerted to the universe, man and life.

Therefore, man is capable to have effect, in the strife for earning livelihood and in the method of livelihood. He is capable to correct the deviation of the unjust ruler or to dispose him. He is capable to have effect in everything that enters in the domain of his free actions. Thus *al-qadariyyah al-ghaybiyyah* is not more than a superstition and imagination.

The Concepts of Islam are Controls for Man's behaviour in Life

The thoughts of Islam are concepts and not information for the sake of knowledge. This means they have tangible meanings in the mainstream of life. They are not just explanations or matter proved to exist by logic only. Rather, every meaning they indicate of has a reality that man can touch. This is the case whether they were deep concepts that need depth and enlightenment to understand, or they were obvious ones that can be understood easily. This is also the case whether they can be sensed by the senses and have tangible reality such as the solutions, thought and general views, or they were unseen, but the one who informed us of them, the mind has confirmed by sensation of his authenticity, such as the angels, the jannah and the **nar** (hell). So all of these are existing realities that have tangible imports/meanings, either by sensation and mind, or by mind only but in a decisive definite way.

However, these tangible meanings are not studies in astronomy, nor information in medicine or thoughts in chemistry, that came to us so as to use what is in the universe. They are rather controls to the conduct of man in this worldly life and towards the Hereafter. They have no relation with other than these at all. They came as guidance, mercy and preaching. They came as treatment for man's actions, and namely for the way of his conduct. If we examine these concepts in the texts from which they were derived; or in other words, if we examined the texts that contained the thoughts that indicate of these concepts, we find them all, with exception, came in this form only, and they are confined in this area only. The texts of the Quran and the Sunnah, whether their words (*mantoog*), which is indicated by the words of the sentence; and their meaning (*mafهوم*) which is indicated by the meaning of the sentence; or their indication (*dalah*), which is required (to understand) from the meaning of the sentence; all of them are confined in one area that is the 'aqeedah, and what emanates from it of rules and is built on it from of thoughts, and there is nothing else.

Thereupon, it is necessary that the Muslim must understand that the sharee'ah texts, the Qur'an and Sunnah, came so as to act upon them. They also came specifically related to his conduct in life. In other words, the Muslim world should understand in Islam the following two matters:

Firstly: Islam came with concepts to control his conduct in the worldly life and towards the Hereafter. So he adopts every thought as a law, so as to regulate his conduct within this law. Thus the practical rather than the teaching side appears in it. It must also be obvious, that if only the teaching side in it has been taken, then It will lose its original side, that is being a law to control the conduct; and it would become just information like geography and history. Thus it would lose the effect of life that exists in it. It would not then be pure Islam, rather Islamic information; where, in regards of their comprehension, the disbeliever **oniantalint** who does not believe in them, and who learns them to attack them and their people will be on the same level with the learned Muslim who believes in them, but he researches in them as information and as scientific enjoyment, without thinking in taking them as controls for the behaviour in the life.

Therefore, knowledge of the Islamic thoughts and the ahkam sharee'ah, without realising them as controls for the human behaviour in the life, is the evil that did not effect for Islam in the behaviour of Muslims nowadays.

As for the second matter which the Muslim must understand in Islam, is that the Qur'an and hadeeth came as a deen and a sharee'ah and not as information and science. They have no

any relation with any of the sciences, neither the history, nor the geography, or physics or chemistry, nor invention or discoveries.

As regards to what came in the Qur'an, in terms of ayah about the moon, stars, plants, seas, mountains, rivers, animals, birds or plants, such as His (swt) saying:

“And the sun runs on to a resting place for it.” [TMQ Ya-sin:38]

And His (swt) saying:

“Which leaps up over the hearts.” [TMQ Al-Humaza:7], and the similar ayah. These has nothing to do with any of the sciences. They are only to draw man's attention to the power of Allah, and they are evidences of the greatness of Allah (swt), and ayah that direct man to what convinces his mind of the necessity in the belief in Allah (swt).

They are evidences on the power and greatness of Allah (swt), and drawing the attention of the minds to understand and be admonished. They are not a study in knowledge or science.

Therefore the thoughts of Islam which the Qur'an and hadeeth came with, did not come for the sake of information,, nor for the scientific research. They rather came to solve the problems of man; thus they are controls of his conduct in the worldly life, and towards the Hereafter.

Penal Code in Islam (Punishments in Islam)

Allah (swt) legislated the punishments in Islam as deterrents and consolations. They are deterrents in order to deter people from committing the crimes. They are also consolation for they take away from the Muslim the punishment of Allah (swt) at the Day of Judgement. The fact that the punishments in Islam are deterrents is established by the text of Qur'an. Allah (swt) says:

“And there is life for you in retaliation, O men of understanding.”
[TMQ Al-Baqarah:129]

The fact that Allah (swt) made life in the retaliation, means that carrying out the retaliation (punishment) is what saved the life; and this is not in saving the life of the one who was punished. For in the retaliation (punishment) is his death and not his life, rather the life of the one who witnessed the occurrence of the retaliation. This is generally the case of the sensible person, when he knows that he will be killed if he killed another, then he would not be involved in killing. This is the case of all the deterrents.

These punishment are not allowed to be inflicted except on the criminal. For the meaning of being deterrents, is that people are deterred from the crime, ie, refrain from committing it.

The crime is the ugly action. The ugly action is that which the Shar'a dispraised it. Thus, an action is not considered a crime unless the Shar'a stated it is an ugly work, then it is considered a crime.

The offence does not exist in the innate nature of man, **nor it is gained/earned which man can gain it**. It is not also a disease by which man is inflicted. It is rather a violation of the system that organises mans' actions.

This is because Allah (swt) created man and created in him instincts and organic needs. These instincts and organic needs are life energy in man that drives him to satisfy them. So he carries out the actions he does for the sake of this satisfaction.

Leaving this satisfaction without a system leads to anarchy and disorder, and it leads to the wrong or abnormal satisfaction.

Allah (swt) organised the satisfaction of these instincts and organic needs when He (swt) organised man's actions by the ahkam sharee'ah. So the Islamic Shar'a explained the treatment of man's actions in the form of guidelines that came in the Kitab and Sunnah. It made in these guidelines the reality of the hukm for every incident that occurs to man. It legislated the halal and the haram. So it brought that from which the hukm of every action of man can be deduced. It also explained the things it prohibited on man. Therefore, Shar'a has brought orders and prohibitions, and commissioned man to do what it ordered him with, and to abstain from what it forbade him. If man violated that he would have done an ugly work; ie he made a crime; whether this was the negligence of doing what he was ordered to do, or undertaking that which he was forbidden from. In both cases, he is considered to have committed a crime. Therefore, it was necessary to have punishment for such crimes, so that people abide by what Allah (swt) ordered them with, and to abstain from what He (swt) forbade them. Otherwise, there would be no sense in these orders and forbiddings if there was no punishment against their violation. For there is no value for any request to be undertaken

if it had before it a punishment to the one who does not carry out such a request, whether this request was a request to do an action or to abstain from an action.

Islamic Shar'a explained that there are punishments in the akhira (Hereafter) and others in the worldly life, on these crimes. As for the punishment of the akhira, it is Allah (swt) who punishes at the Day of Judgement. Allah (swt) says:

"The guilty will be known by their marks, and will be taken by the forelocks and the feet."

[TMQ Ar-Rahman:41]

"And those who disbelieved, they have the fire of jahannam." [TMQ Fatir:36]

"This (is for the righteous). And Lo! For the transgressors there will be an evil journey's end... Hell, where they will burn, and evil resting place."

[TMQ Sad :55/56]

"Lo! We have prepared for disbelievers manacles and carcass and a raging fire." [TMQ Al-Insan:4]

Allah (swt) explained these punishments explicitly in Qur'an. So they will definitely take place because there were mentioned in ayah that are definite in proof and definite in meaning. Allah (swt) says:

"When carcass are about their necks and chains. They are dragged. Through boiling waters; then they are thrust in the fire." [TMQ Gafir:71/72]

"Therefore, he has no close friend here this day. Nor any food save filth. Which none but sinners eat." [TMQ Al-Haqqa:35/37]

"Boiling fluid will be poured down on their heads." [TMQ Al-Hajj:19]

"Lo the guilty are in error and madness. On the day when they are dragged into the fire upon their faces (it is said to them): feel the touch of hell."

[TMQ Al-Qamar:47/48]

"In scorching wind and scalding water. And shadow of black smoke."

[TMQ Al-Waqia:42/43]

"You verily will eat of a tree called zaqqoom. And you will fill your bellies therewith. And thereon you will drink of boiling water. Drinking even as the camels drink." [TMQ Al-Waqia:52/55]

"Then the welcome will be boiling water. And roasting at hell-fire."

[TMQ Al-Waqia:93/94]

"But nay! For Lo! It's the fire of hell. Eager to roast." [TMQ Al-Maarij:15/16]

"(It will be said): Take him and fetter him. And then expose him to hell-fire. And then insert him in a chain whereof the length is seventy cubits." [TMQ Al-Haqqa:30/32]

"As often as their skins are consumed We shall exchange them for fresh skins that they may taste the torment." [TMQ An-Nisaa:56]

Thus, there are many ayah that explain the torment of Allah (swt) in a definite way and in a miraculous style. When man hears them, the fright will grip him and the terror will fill him. He will belittle every torment in the dunya, and every physical hardship, if he conceived the torment and the fright of the torment of the akhira. Thus he will not dare to violate the orders and prohibition of Allah (swt), unless he had forgotten this torment and its fright.

This is the punishment of the akhirah. As for the punishment of the dunya, Allah (swt) explained it in the Qur'an and hadeeth in a general and detailed form. He (swt) answered the State to carry it out.

The punishment of Islam which He (swt) stated to be imposed on the guilty, in the dunya, the Imam (Muslim Leader) or his deputy undertakes it. In other words the Islamic State carries it out through the execution of the *hudood* (determined punishments) of Allah or what is less of the *hudood* in terms of the *ta'zeer* (discretionary punishments) and *kaffarat* (atonements).

This punishment in the dunya over a specific sin, carried out by the State, eliminates the punishments will be deterrents and eliminators. They deter the people from doing the offences and from committing the crimes and sins. They also eliminate the punishment of the *akhirah*, thus the punishment of the *akhirah* will be abolished from the Muslim.

The evidence on that is what **al-Bukhari narrated from 'Ubadah bin as-Samit (ra) who said: "Rasool Allah (saw) said to us at a gathering: 'You give me bai'ah that you do not associate anything with Allah, you do not steal, you do not commit adultery, you do not murder your children, you do not forge lies amongst yourselves and you do not disobey in a ma'roof (good action). Whoever of you fulfilled that he has his reward with Allah. And whoever committed anything of that and punished in the dunya then it will be atonement to him, then his matter is with Allah. If He wished He punished him, and if He wished He forgave him.'**

This is explicit that the punishment of the dunya by the Imam or his representative over a specific offence would abolish the punishment of the *akhirah*. That is why many Muslims used to come to Rasool Allah (saw), where they would acknowledge the guilts they did so as to inflict on them the *hudood* (punishment) in the dunya so that the torment of Allah (swt) at the Day of Judgement is abolished from them. They would hear the pains of the *hudood* and retaliation in the dunya because it is easier than the torment of the *akhirah*.

Tamyeez Ghareezi (Instinctive Discernment)

People frequently confuse the thought with the *tamyeez ghareezi*, so they were unable to differentiate between them. Thus they fell in mistakes, some of which are funny and some are misleading. Some of them, considered the child once born to have mind and thought. Some others considered the animal to have thought. Some others, **their lack of identification the thought from the *tamyeez ghareezi***, led them to error in defining the thought and the mistake in understanding the mind (‘aql). Therefore, it is necessary to explain what is the *tamyeez ghareezi*, and to explain what is the thought, the mind or the comprehension.

Tamyeez Ghareezi (instinctive identification) occurs in animals due to the repetition of its sensation of the reality. This is because the animal has a brain and has senses, the same as man. However, the brain of the animal is void of the capability of linking (*rabt*). It has rather the centre of senses only. It has no previous information to link it with the reality or with the sensation. It rather has imprints of the reality. It recovers such imprints when it senses the reality. Such recovery is not linkage (*rabt*); it is rather the motion of the centre of senses due to sensation of the previous reality or of a new reality connected with the first reality. From such recovery of sensation, a *tamyees ghareezi* (instinctive identification) takes place. It is identification that determines the conduct of the animal towards the satisfaction of the instructor or the organic needs. This conduct is limited only in the satisfaction or no satisfaction and not for anything else at all.

Thereupon, what occurs to the animal is only sensation of the reality, regardless of how much this sensation was repeated or varied. This sensation is what drives its satisfaction or not. For example, if food is offered to an animal or a bird, it can identify whether it can be eaten or not. Then it decides its conduct towards it, so either it eats it or turns away from it. It does not have more than that. If it reached to that identification in regards of the satisfaction it would limit itself to that. It can't do more than that, nor it will try to do more than that. If barley and soil were presented to a horse, it would try to examine which of them is food for satisfaction. Once it found that it to be in the barley and not in the soil then the sensation that the barley satisfies its need and the soil does not will be fixed in it. So, it would later on leave away the soil once it sensed it, and it would take the barley once it sensed it, if it was hungry.

This identification (*tamyeez*) occurred in the animal from an experiment that took place by means of sensation. This experiment is enough, even if it was once; and whether it occurred from it or from another as long as it sensed what happened with the other; and whether it was an experiment on one thing or an experiment over various things. All of these produce instinctive identification. However, what occurs more with the animal is the experiment over one thing. It might happen with many experiments, such as the experiment on the barley and the soil, or the experiment on the sweet, bitter and sour (things). It might also happen with it in complicated experiments, so it stems from it the recovery of the sensation in a way that it looks as if it is thinking; while, in fact, it is the recovery of what it sensed before, and not linkage with information. This is like the example of the experiment of stealing the eggs by the mice. It was noticed that two mice go to the eggs market. One of them would lie on its back and the other pushes the egg on the belly of this lying mouse, which will hold on to the egg with its two legs, while the other one drags it by its tail to their nest, where they place it. Then they return back to bring another one in the same way. This process is complicated, but it resulted from recovering the sensations and not from the linkage of information. These experiments only occur wherever to make satisfaction or whatever related to what achieves satisfaction. So the case of the mice does not occur with other than what is eaten. It might

however occur with other than the eggs which makes satisfaction. Thus, what occurred from the mouse and the horse, and what occurs from the monkey and the camel and others is not thinking. It is rather instinctive identification; and it relates only to what makes satisfaction; and it is nothing more than identification. So it never reaches to know what is that thing that made satisfaction, nor to know what is that which does not make satisfaction. Therefore, it is instinctive identification and not thought, mind or comprehension. Similar to the animal is the child once born, though his brain has the capability of making linkage (with the information), it has no information to make such linkage with the sensation of the new reality so as to identify it. Therefore, no thought, mind or comprehension occurs in it. What only occurs in it is instinctive identification of the thing in regards of making satisfaction or not. It does not make in it knowledge of the reality of the thing which it identified satisfaction in it. It can't know what is the thing that satisfies and what which does not. What rather occurs in it is an identification within the limits of satisfaction or not only. If an apple and a rock were offered to a child, he would try once of them. The one which he finds satisfaction in it, he eats it and he throws away the other. This would direct in him an experiment by which he takes the apple and throws away the rock, through an instinctive identification that occurred from the experiment only. This is because there are no information yet with him. If he had information he would use them naturally, because linkage is part of its brain. His sensation of a thing is linked inevitably with the information. Thus, the presence of a concept about a thing would be inevitably linked with the sensation of it. At that point thought, mind or comprehension starts in the child, once the information with which he makes linkage existed.

Therefore, the instinctive identification is sensation of the reality by the senses, from which the identification of the thing occurs, of whether it makes satisfaction or not. This is different to the thought which is the transferring of the reality by the senses to the brain, together with previous information that explains this reality. Thus thought is judgement on the thing. While instinctive identification is explaining whether the thing makes satisfaction or not and nothing more.

Fear (Khawf)

Fear is one of the external appearances of the survival instinct. Its existence in man is inevitable because it is a part of his creation and it existed in him naturally with his creation. However, it is like other external appearances of the survival instinct such as sovereignty, defence, and compassion and others, even like those of other instincts which are the religiousness and reproduction; it does not appear unless there is a motive. If there is no such motive, fear will not appear at all. This motive which provokes fear is the same like any other motive that provokes any of the instincts. It is either a tangible physical thing, or a thought that is connected with it or related to it. However, this physical tangible thing or the thought, must be understood that it causes fear of felt emotionally that it causes fear. Unless this understanding or that feeling occurred, then no fear will take place, because the energy of the instinct will not move nor will it be agitated unless the emotions of fear in the thing have been connected with a concept or with an instinctive identification. Thus, though it is the innate nature, that is created with man, fear does not occur except with the presence of something that agitates it.

Fear is once of the dangerous problems due to which the declined peoples and the weak nations suffer humiliation and backwardness. If fear dominated on a person it prevented him of the life pleasure, deprived him of the noble characters, caused in him the mental disorder and the incapability to judge on matters and paralysed in him the memory and capability of identification.

The worst type of fear is that from imaginations and ghosts. This does not occur except to those of weak minds. This is either because the mind in them did not grow, like the children; or due to the absence of enough information to link them with reality, such as the ignorant people and every person who lacks the information because of his (type of) life in society as the case of most women; or due to natural weakness in their brains such as the foolish people and the disabled ones and their likes. The fear in these people is treated either by deep discussion with them and bringing near the matters to their understanding; or giving them thoughts related to what they sense of on the condition that these thoughts have a reality they can sense. With this treatment they can rid themselves of the power of fear, either by removing it or reducing it gradually until its 'deep rooted' concepts are up rooted.

There is another type of fear that is less dangerous than the fear of imaginations. It is that which results from the incorrect evaluation of matters. So man might see something thinking it is scary, though it might not be so. He might see a sleeping dog thinking it is a mad dog, for he had seen a similar mad dog before. So he becomes frightened from passing it in the road and flees from it. Had he verified the matter he would find it to be a tame dog that does not scare, and it is sleeping and not feeling of his passing. He might see a lion inside a cage, so he becomes afraid to approach it lest the lion comes out to him. The lion might rage, so his fear increases and he runs away thinking the lion might go out of the cage. The lack of estimation mostly occurs in the semantic matters such as an article or a speech in a place, or conversation with a ruler or discussion with an influential person or the likes. The lack of proper estimation of matters causes him fear, so he abstains from writing, giving a speech or discussion in fear of harm.

There is another common fear that results from the absence of comparison between what results from undertaking an action and what results from abstaining from doing it. Both of them cause harm; so the error in this comparison leads to fear from the simple matters and the

fall in dangers. This is like the fear from the oppressive ruler that he might inflict harm on the individual, which leads to inflicting harm on the Ummah and including the individual himself as one of the Ummah. This is also like the fear of the soldier in the battlefield from death, which leads to the annihilation of the whole army including the soldier himself. This is also like the fear from prison for the sake of the 'aqeedah which he embraces, that leads to the waste of the 'aqeedah from him, which is more harmful than the prison or the disappearance of the 'aqeedah from the worldly life. This type of fear is very dangerous to the Ummah, which leads to dangers, rather to destruction and annihilation.

However, fear is useful and beneficial in some situations, and it is necessary to exist or to initiate. It is also harmful and destructive in some situations, and it must not exist and must be treated and removed. So the fear from the real dangers is beneficial and it is obligatory. Recklessness of these dangers and the lack of fear from them is harmful, and it should not occur, whether they were dangers on the individual himself or on his Ummah. Fear in this case is the guard and the protector. Therefore, it is necessary to explain the dangers that surround the Ummah so as to take account of them and work to defend herself and to remove these dangers. The fear from Allah (swt) and from His torment is beneficial and obligatory, and it is the guardian and the protector. Therefore, it is necessary to agitate the fear from Allah (swt) in the souls, and to explain the degree of the torment of Allah (swt) for committing the sins and the kufr, so that people follow His deen, and perform His orders and abstain from His prohibitions. This fear and its like is beneficial and useful; and it must exist, and work should be done to create it, for it is the guard and the protector; and it is the one that secures the march of man at the straight path.

Therefore, fear is a part of man's innate nature. The concepts are responsible for agitating it in man, and for removing it from man. In some areas, it is of the most dangerous on man; and it is of the greatest benefit in other areas. In order that man protects oneself of its dangers, and enjoys of its benefits, it is obligatory upon him to keep it under the control of the true concepts alone, that is the concepts of Islam.

The Reality (*Waqi'*) and the Concept (*Mafhoom*) are what agitates the Instincts

The instinct is different from the organic need though each of them is a natural life energy. The organic need requires inevitable satisfaction, and man dies if it is not satisfied. This is different to the instinct, which only requires satisfaction; and if it was not satisfied; man becomes worried, but he does not die, he rather remains alive. So, if man did not eat or answer his natural call he dies, but if he did not satisfy his instinct he does not die. If he did not have a sexual communication with a woman or did not pray he does not die, because the instinct does not need inevitable satisfaction. Moreover, the organic need is agitated for satisfaction from inside by itself, and it is stirred for satisfaction from outside. This is different to the instinct, it is never agitated from inside, and the feeling for need of satisfaction does not occur except by a external motive. If there is anything that agitates it from outside it is stirred, and the feeling that requires satisfaction exist. If there is nothing outside to provoke it, it remains latent, and there would be no feeling for satisfaction. Thus, hunger comes from inside naturally, and it does not need an external motive to exist. Then the feeling that requires satisfaction for the organic need comes from man himself, so he feels with hunger, even if there is nothing from outside that made it happen. However, the external motive might agitate the hunger. So the pleasant food might stir the feeling of hunger; and the talk about the pleasant food might also stir the feeling of hunger. While the sexual feeling is not agitated from itself at all; it rather needs something from outside to provoke it. Thus, the feeling that requires the satisfaction of the instinct does not arise from man himself at all; and man does not feel it unless there is an external motive that agitates it. So, there will be no wish for sexual communication, nor a feeling for that unless man saw a tangible reality that initiates this feeling; or a person spoke before him about some realities that agitate such feeling; or some meanings came to his mind, which initiated some concepts that agitate this feeling. So, unless there is a tangible reality or thought, this feeling can't be agitated. Therefore, the presence of instinct does not create by itself worry in man. It is rather the agitation of the feeling that requires satisfaction that causes the worry when satisfaction is not attained. If there were no feeling for satisfaction for the absence of what provokes it, then there will never be worry. Therefore, there is no worry for man due to the lack of satisfying his sexual instinct; and there will be no suppression (of it) if there were no reality or a thought that stirs it. So, it is foolishness and short sight to place amidst people the thoughts that give concepts about sex like the books and plays about sex. It is also stupidity and short sight to make room for initiating the tangible reality that agitates the reproduction instinct through the free mixing of men with women. This is because that means creating that which provokes the sexual feeling; and creating the worry until this feeling is satisfied; then creating such reality which provokes it again, so it is agitated for satisfaction always. Thus he becomes preoccupied with work to achieve satisfaction, or worried when he does not achieve such satisfaction. This is indeed the intellectual decline and the permanent distress. Therefore, the free mixing of men with women is the most harmful matter on society, for it turns the effort for satisfaction and keeps the mind busy with the concepts of satisfaction, or place man in permanent worry. The wide circulation of the sexual books is also one of the most harmful matters on society.

Islam came with concepts that organise the sex in a positive way by the system of marriage and whatever expands from it relates to it. It came to prevent between man and whatever provokes the feeling of reproduction and does not achieve its satisfaction; and between man and whatever might make him use most of his time in thinking or in work to satisfy the reproduction instinct. So it prohibited the *khulwah* between the man and the woman which is not *maharram* (ie, marriageable) other than his wife. This is because it provokes the

reproduction instinct and he can't satisfy it according to the system he embraces. This would cause worry for him, or indecently violate the system. The evidence of this prohibition came clear in the authentic hadeeth, where Rasool Allah (saw) said:

"No one of you should be alone with a woman unless (she is) with somebody mahram (not marriageable to her)."

He (saw) also said:

"No man, from this day, should be alone secretly with hidden (woman) except with one man or two with him."

In another hadeeth, he (saw) explained that the shaytan tempts the man and the woman in case of *khulwa*, for it will be the third with them.

Rasool Allah (saw) said:

"No man is alone with a woman, then indeed shaytan is their third."

Therefore, men must remove away from what incites the reproduction instinct and what provokes their feelings, in response to the order of Islam.

Islam is Concepts for Life and not Information only

Concepts of Islam are not priestly ones, nor pure metaphysical (*ghaybi*) ones. They are rather thoughts that have practical meanings that the mind can comprehend directly when it is capable to do so. Or it comprehends what they indicate of in a definite rather than speculative way when it is unable to comprehend them directly, thus it would comprehend the tangible which these meanings indicate, in a decisive way and without any doubt.

All the Islamic concepts are subject to sensation directly, or what they indicate is subject to sensation directly. In other words all the thoughts of Islam are concepts, for they are either comprehended by the mind, or they result from a thing comprehended by the mind, ie, the mind indicated it. There is not any thought in Islam except that it has a concept (ie it has a reality in the mind) which is comprehended by the mind; or consented to in a decisive way, and has a reality in the mind, which what it indicates is comprehended by the mind.

Therefore, there are no *mughayyabat* (unseen matters) in Islam. The *mughayyabat* which Islam ordered to believe in are not purely metaphysical. They are unseen but connected with the mind, through the comprehension of the mind of what they indicate, which are the Qur'an and hadeeth mutawatir. Therefore, all of Islam is of tangible reality in the worldly life, because each one of its thoughts has a reality in the mind of man, built on sensation and dependent on the mind. Thus, the mind is the basis upon which Islam, as an 'aqeedah and ahkam, is built. It's 'aqeedah and ahkam are tangibly understood, without difference between the *mughayyabat* (unseen matters) and the *mahsoosat* (the tangible matters), and with difference between the views about matters which are the thoughts, the rules about matter which are the ahkam or information of matters or absent matters.

Thus, the thoughts, ahkam, *mahsoosat* and *mughayyabat* are all realities that have reality in mind that is dependent on mind, comprehension or thought.

As regards the 'aqeedah, which is the belief in Allah, His Angels, His Books, His Messengers, the Last Day and *al-qadhaa' wal-qadar*, all of these are believed in based on a reality (*waqi'*) they have, and each of them has a reality in the mind.

Belief in Allah, Qur'an and the prophethood of Mohammad (saw) took place based on the sensory comprehension of the mind of the existence of Allah (swt), the *azali*, that has no beginning. The sensory comprehension of the mind that Qur'an is the speech of Allah comes from its sensory comprehension, every time of the (i'jaz) incapacitation of Qur'an to mankind (to bring its like), and the sensory comprehension of mind that Mohammad is the Prophet and Messenger of Allah, from its sensory comprehension, that he is the one who came with the Qur'an, the speech of Allah, that incapacitates mankind. So these three matters: The existence of Allah, that Qur'an is the speech of Allah and that Mohammad is the Rasool of Allah, the mind has directly comprehended their reality (*waq'i*) definitely, by the means of sensation. So the mind believed in them, and they became to have a reality in the mind and a sensed reality.

As regards to the belief in the Angels, Torah and Injeel and other heavenly (divine) books, the belief in the Messengers and Prophets like Moosa (as), Isa (as), Haroon (as), Nooh (as) and Adam (as), thus existed based on the information of Qur'an and hadeeth mutawatir about them, and the command to believe in them. So they became to have a reality in the mind based on a sensed reality, which is the Qur'an and the hadeeth mutawatir. Thus, they all

became concepts for they are meanings of thought; since they have a reality that exists in the mind.

As regards to the belief in *al-qadhaa' wal-qadr*, it existed based on the sensory comprehension of the mind of the human action, that it took place from man or on him against his will; and the sensory comprehension of the mind that the attributes of objects are not created by them. The evidence for this is that burning does not occur except at a specific degree. Had burning been created by the object it would have occurred the way it likes without submission to a specific degree, ie, to specific order. Thus the attribute is created by other than it, who is Allah (swt), and not by it. Therefore, the mind comprehended the reality of *al-qadhaa' wal-qadar* directly and definitely through using the sensation. So it believed in them, and they became to have a reality in the mind and a sensed reality. Thus, they are concepts for they are meanings of thoughts; since they have a reality that exists in the mind. Therefore, the Islamic 'aqeedah is concepts that definitely exist, and definitely proved. They have a reality in the mind of Muslim which he senses, or senses what indicates of them. Thus, they have active affect on him.

As regards to the ahkam sharee'ah, they are treatments to reality. It is necessary, in their regard, to study and understand the reality. It is also necessary to study the hukm of Allah (swt) regarding this reality by understanding the shar'eeh texts related to it; then this understanding is applied to the reality to realize whether it is the hukm of Allah or not. If it applies to it, in the view of the Mujtahid, then this understanding is the hukm of Allah (swt) concerning him. If it does not apply to it, he looks for another understanding or another text, till he finds an understanding of a text that applies to the reality. Thus, the ahkam sharee'ah are concepts that have a reality in the mind, because they are tangible text, so they are concepts.

Thereupon, the Islamic 'aqeedah and the ahkam sharee'ah are not information for memorisation, nor thoughts for intellectual entertainment only. They are rather concepts that motivate for action, and make the behaviour of them restricted by them, adjusted in accordance with them. That is why Islam, all of it, is concepts that control man, and not information only.

Personality (Ash-Shaksiyyah)

Personality of every person consists of his mentality and emotions. There is no role in it for his shape, body, tidiness and the like. All of such things are superficialities. It is a shallow view that any body thinks that these are factors in the personality, or they affect on the personality. This is because man is distinguished by his mind; and his behaviour is what indicates of his elevation or lowliness. Since the behaviour of man in life is only in accordance with his concepts, then his behaviour is inevitably linked with his concepts and can't be separated from them. Behaviour is the action which undertakes to satisfy his instincts or his organic needs. So he proceeds inevitably in accordance with the inclinations (*muyool*) that exist in him as a human. Thus, his concepts and his inclinations are the continents of his personality. As regards to what are these concepts, what they are made of and what are their results? What are these *muyool*, what initiates them, and what is their effect? All of this needs explanation.

Concepts are the meanings of the thoughts, rather than the meanings of the expression. The expression is a speech that indicates meanings, that might exist in reality or not. So the poet says:

Some of the... (see person. I)

This meaning exists in reality (*waqi'*), and comprehended by sensation, though its comprehension needs depth and enlightenment. The poet also says:

They said... (see person. I)

This meaning does not exist at all... continue from person I...

As regards the meaning of the thought, in case this meaning contained in the expression has a reality that can be sensed, or the mind conceives it as a sensed matter, then this meaning will be understood (a concept) with the one who senses it and conceives it. However, it will not be understood (a concept) with the one who does not sense it and conceive it. This is even if he understood the meaning of the sentence said to him or he read it. Therefore, it is necessary that man learns speech in an intellectual way, whether he read it or heard it. In other words, he must understand the meanings of the sentences as they indicate and not as what their speaker or their listener wants them to indicate. He must at the same time, comprehend the reality of these meanings in his mind, in a way that characterises to him this reality, so as these meanings become concepts. Thus, the concepts are the meanings which have a reality comprehended in the mind, whether this reality was tangible outside the mind, or it has a reality that is agreed upon to exist outside the mind, based on a tangible reality. Other meanings of expressions and sentences are not called concepts. They are rather information only.

Concepts are developed from linking the reality with the information, or from linking the information with the reality. Through the crystallisation of this formation, in accordance with the rule or rules upon which the information and reality are measured at the moment of linkage, ie, according to his understanding of the reality and the information at the moment of linkage, ie, according to his comprehension of them. Through that, a mentality will exist in man, by which it understands the words and sentences, comprehends the meanings with their distinct reality, and issues judgement on it (reality). Thus, the mentality is the manner, according to which, the matter is understood, ie, comprehended. In other words, it is the manner by which the reality is linked with the information, or the information is linked with

the reality, through measuring them with a particular rule or rules. This explains the differences between the mentalities, such as the Islamic mentality, the communist mentality, the capitalist mentality, the disordered mentality and the monotonous mentality.

As regards the results of these concepts, they are the ones that determine the behaviour of man towards the comprehended reality, and determine to him the type of inclination (*muyool*) towards this reality, in terms of turning to or away from it. They might create for him a certain inclination and a specific taste.

As regards the inclinations, they are the motives that drive man to satisfaction, linked with the concepts he hold about the things with which he wants to satisfy. These inclination are initiated in man by the life energy that drives him to satisfy his instincts and organic needs, together with the link that goes on between this life energy and the concepts. These inclinations alone, ie the motives when connected with the concepts about life, are what forms the emotions (*nafsiyyah*) of man. Thus, the *nafsiyyah* is the manner according to which the satisfaction of the instincts and organic needs takes place. In other words, it is the manner according to which the motives of satisfaction are linked with the concepts. So, it is a blend of the inevitable linkage that happens naturally inside man between his motives and the concepts he has about the things linked with his concepts about life.

The personality consists of this mentality and these emotions (*nafsiyyah*). Though mind ('aql) or comprehension is natural in man and inevitably exists in every human being, the formation of the mentality takes place by the effort of man. Though the inclination (*muyool*) are also natural in man, and inevitably exist in every human being, the formation of the *nafsiyyah* takes place by the effort of man. Since the existence of a rule or rules, according to which the evaluation of the information and the reality, at the moment of linkage, takes place is what crystallises the meaning so as to become a concept. Since also the blend that occurs between the motives and the concept is what crystallises the motive so as to become inclination. Then the rule or rules on which man measures the information and the reality at the moment of linkage has the greatest effect in the formation of the '*aqliyyah* and *nafsiyyah*, ie the greatest effect in the formation of the personality in a particular way. If the rule or rules upon which the '*aqliyyah* is formed is the same rule or rules upon which the *nafsiyyah* is formed, then the person would have a personality distinguished with a specific tint. If the rule or rules on which the '*aqliyyah* is formed is different than the rule or rules on which the *nafsiyyah* is formed, then the '*aqliyyah* of the person will be different from his *nafsiyyah*. This is because he would then measure his inclinations or a rule or rules that exists deep inside him. So he would link his motives with concepts other than those by which his '*aqliyyah* was formed. **So he becomes a personality that has no distinctive, variant, different;** his thoughts are different than his inclinations (*mayool*), for he understands the words and sentences and comprehends the realities in a way different than his inclination to the matters.

Therefore, the treatment and formation of the personality are only by developing one rule for both the mentality and *nafsiyyah* of the person. In other words, the rule on which he measures the information and the reality at the moment of linkage is taken as the same rule on whose basis the blend between the motives and the concepts takes place. Thus, the personality will be formed on one rule, one measure, and accordingly it becomes a distinct personality.

Islamic Personality

Islam treated man in a complete way so as to form to him a particular personality distinct from others. So it treated his thoughts by the 'aqeedah, whereby it made by it an intellectual basis upon which he builds his thoughts, on its basis he forms his concepts. Thus he can differentiate between the correct thought and the wrong thought when he measures this thought with the Islamic 'aqeedah, where he builds his thoughts on it as an intellectual basis. Thus his 'aqliyyah is formed on this 'aqeedah, and he would have by that an 'aqliyyah distinguished with this intellectual basis. He would also have a correct criterion for the thoughts, by which he guards himself against the lapse of thought, and protect himself from the corrupt thought, and remain true in his thought and sensed in his comprehension. At the same time Islam treated the actions of man that originate from his organic needs and instincts, by the ahkam sharee'ah that emanate from this 'aqeedah. It treated these actions correctly, so it regulated the instincts without suppressing them; it harmonised between them without setting them loose; and facilitated to him the satisfaction of all his needs, in harmony that leads to tranquillity and settlement. Islam made the Islamic 'aqeedah rational so it became good to be an intellectual basis upon which thoughts are measured. It made a collective thought about the universe, man and life. Since the person is a human being who lives in this universe, then collective thought solves all of his problems inside him and outside him. Thus it is suitable to become a general concept, ie, a criterion that is used naturally when the blend between the motives and the concepts takes place, ie. a criterion on whose basis the inclination (*muyool*) are formed. Thus Islam developed in man a definite basis, that is used as a definite criterion for both of the concepts and inclinations (*muyool*), ie for the 'aqliyyah and *nafsiyyah*, at the same time. Thus it formed the personality in a particular way, distinct from other personalities.

Thus, we find Islam formed the Islamic personality with the Islamic 'aqeedah, where by his 'aqliyyah is formed as well as his *nafsiyyah*. It appears from this that the Islamic 'aqliyyah is that which thinks according to Islam, ie., it makes Islam alone the general criterion for the thoughts about life. It is not only the learned 'aqliyyah or the intellectual 'aqliyyah. It is rather enough that man makes Islam a criterion for all the thoughts, practically and really, to have an Islamic 'aqliyyah.

As for the Islamic *nafsiyyah*, it is the one that makes all of its inclinations (*muyool*) on the basis of Islam. In other words, it makes Islam alone the general criterion for all of his satisfactions. It is not only the ascetic or strict one. It is rather enough that man makes Islam a criterion for all of his satisfactions practically and really, to have an Islamic *nafsiyyah*, regardless of whether he is learned or ignorant, he performs the fards and mandoobs, and gives up the harams and makroohs or he does that and more, in terms of *t'aat* (preferable deeds) and abandoning the *shubuhah* (doubled deeds). Each of these two types is considered an Islamic personality. This is because every one who thinks on the basis of Islam, and makes his desires (*hawa*) in accordance with Islam, he is an Islamic personality.

It is true that Islam ordered the pursuit of more Islamic culture, so that this mentality grows and becomes capable to measure every thought (on the basis of Islam). It also ordered to perform more than the *furoodh* (obligations), *mandoobat* (preferable matters) and *mustahabbat* (good deeds). It as well forbade more than the *muharramat* (prohibited matters), the *makroohad* (disliked matters) and *shubuhah* (doubled things), so as this *nafsiyyah* becomes stronger and capable to deter every *mayool* (inclination) that disagrees with Islam. All of that is for the sake of elevating this personality and making it proceed in the path of

ascent. However, that which is below this level would not be a non Islamic personality, and what is below it, such as the common Muslims who judge their behaviour in accordance with Islam; and the educated people who limit themselves to performing the duties and abstaining from the prohibition; both are Islamic personality. Though the strength of these personalities contrast, they are all still Islamic personalities. What matters for judging on a person to be an Islamic personality is his adoption of Islam as a basis for his thinking and a basis for his inclinations. This explains the contrast of the Islamic personalities, the contrast of the Islamic mentalities, and the contrast of the Islamic *nafsiyyahs*. Therefore, those who conceive the Islamic personality as an angel is strongly mistaken. The harm of such people (who hold such view) in the society is very great, because they look for the angel (personality) among the people, but they never find it; they rather don't find it in themselves. So they become desperate and lose any hope in the Muslims. These fanciful people only prove Islam to be utopian and impossible to implement; and that it is only beautiful ideals that are impossible for men to implement or endure them. So, they turn the people away from Islam, and discourage many people from action. This is despite that Islam came so as to be applied practically and it is a practical deen which is not difficult to implement. It is within every human means, regardless of how much weak is his thinking, and how much strong are his instincts and organic needs. So, he can implement Islam upon himself easily, and simply, after he understood the 'aqeedah and became an Islamic personality. This is because once he made the 'aqeedah of Islam the criterion of his concepts and inclination, and he proceeded according to this criterion, then he would be definitely an Islamic personality. After that, he has only to strengthen this personality with Islamic culture to develop his mentality, and with the *ta'aat* (good deeds) to strengthen his *nafsiyyah*. Thus, he proceeds in ascent, and remains at this high level in the dunya, and attains the pleasure of Allah (swt) in the dunya and al-akhirah.

Du'a in Islam

Du'a is the request of the servant from his Lord. Du'a is of the greatest 'ibadah, ie the greatest of worship to Allah (swt). **Tirmidhi reported from a hadeeth by Anas:**

“Du'a is the brain (essence) of 'ibadah (worship).”

Many reports came from the Prophet (saw) that encouraged the du'a and urged on it. **Ibn Majah narrated from a hadeeth by Abu Hurairah:**

“There is nothing more honourable to Allah than du'a.”

Al-Bukhari narrated a hadeeth:

“Whoever does not ask Allah, He will be angry of him.”

Tirmidhi reported hadeeth from Ibn Ma'ood:

“Ask Allah from His favour, for Allah loves to be asked.”

Tirmidhi also narrated a hadeeth from Ibn 'Umar:

“Du'a averts from what occur and from what did not occur. So, O servants of Allah, help yourself with du'a.”

Tirmidhi and al-Hakim reported from a hadeeth from 'Ubadah ibn as-Samit:

“Any Muslim on the face of the earth makes a du'a for something to Allah save Allah gave it to him, or averted, of the bad matter, the like of it, from him.”

Ahmad reported a marfoo' hadeeth from Aby Said:

“Any Muslim who makes a du'a (for something) that has no sin in it and nor a sever of the bonds of kinship save Allah gave him with it one of three: Either He will speed to him his call (d'awah), or save it to him in the akhirah or avert from him a bad thing (soo') equal to it.”

These ahadeeth and the like indicate as a whole, the proof of the existence of du'a, which is the servants' request from his Lord. There are many ayah in the Qur'an that indicated on du'a. Allah (swt) says:

“And your Lord has said: Pray (make du'a) to Me and I will hear your prayer.”

[TMQ Gafir:60]

And He (swt) said:

“And when My servants question you concerning Me, then surely I am near. I answer the prayer (du'a) of the supplicant when he cries to Me.” [TMQ Al-Baqarah:186]

And He (swt) said:

“Is not He (best) Who answers the wronged one when he cries to Him and removes the evil, and has made you viceroys of the earth?” [TMQ An-Naml:62]

He (swt) said about the du'a of the angels:

“Those who carry the Throne, and all who are round about it, hymn the praises of their Lord and believe in Him and ask forgiveness for those who believe (saying): Our Lord! You encompassed everything in mercy and knowledge, therefore forgive those who repent and follow Your way; Ward off from them the punishment off hell! Our Lord! And make them enter the Gardens of Eden which you have promised them, with such of their fathers and their wives and their descendants as do right. Lo! You only You, are the Mighty, the Wise.” [TMQ Gafir:7/8]

So Allah (swt) asked us to pray to Him, and He explained to us that He alone is the One who responds to the du'as. He (swt) showed us some of what the angels used to make du'a with. Thus it is mandoob for the Muslim to make du'a to Allah (swt) in the comfortable and difficult times, secretly and openly, so as to gain the thawab (reward of Allah). Making du'a is better than remaining silent and acceptance (of what occurs). This is due to many evidences that indicate this; and also to show humiliation to Allah (swt) and need for Him. It must, however, be clear that du'a does not change what is in the 'ilm (knowledge) of Allah (swt), nor it prevents a *qadhaa'*, nor stop a *qadar*, or initiates something different to its case. This is because the 'ilm of Allah (swt) definitely takes place; and the *qadhaa'* of Allah (swt) inevitably takes place; for if du'a averted it then it would not be *qadhaa'*. The *qadar* is also created by Allah (swt), so du'a does not negate it. Allah (swt), also, created the causes and the effects, and He made the cause inevitably produce the effect; and if it did not produce then it would not be a cause. Therefore, one should not believe that the du'a is a method to discharge a need, even if Allah (swt) accepted (the du'a) and the need is really discharged. This is because Allah (swt) made for the universe, man and life a system it proceeds according to it, and He linked the causes with the effects. The du'a does not have effect in infringing the laws of Allah (swt), nor in the lack of action of the causes. The aim of the du'a is to attain the reward by responding with the order of Allah. It is a worship like other forms of worship. Just as the salah is a worship, the fast is a worship, the zakah is a worship, the du'a is also a worship. So, the believer prays to his Lord (makes du'a) and requests from Him (swt) to discharge his need or remove his affliction, or other types of du'a related to the dunya and al-akhirah. He does that as a seek of refuge in Him, submission to Him, yearning for His pleasure and compliance to His orders. If his need was fulfilled, this would be a favour from Allah (swt). Its discharge would be in accordance with the laws of Allah (swt), and proceeding on the principle of linking the causes with the effects. If He (swt) did not fulfil it, then he will be given the reward of such du'as.

Therefore, the du'a from the Muslim must be submission to Him, and response to His orders and pursuit of His reward, whether his need was fulfilled or not. The Muslim is allowed to pray with any du'a he wants, whether by the heart, words or any expression (of words) he views. He is not bound with a specific du'a. So he can make du'a with those mentioned in the Qur'an, or those mentioned in the hadeeth. He can make du'a from himself or from others. Simply, he is not restricted with a specific du'a. He is rather asked to make du'a to Allah (swt). However, it is better that he makes du'a with that mentioned in the Qur'an and hadeeth.

The Meaning of Sanctification (Taqdees)

Taqdees is the ultimate hearty respect. It takes place from man towards persons and objects, either based on emotional motive linked with instinctive concepts, or based on an intellectual motive linked with emotions agitated by the same motive thought. The *taqdees* of the idols and legendary heroes takes place by an emotional motive linked with instinctive concepts about the deities and majesties. The *taqdees* of Allah (swt), through worshipping Him or submission and surrender to His rules, takes place motivated by the realisation of the mind that Allah (swt) is the only one worthy of worship, or the comprehension of the mind that these rules are from Allah (swt), so subjection and submission to them is obligatory. In both cases, this motive would be linked with the emotions of religiousness (*tadayyun*), which are the feeling of weakness and need to the Creator, the Organiser.

Taqdees is natural, and it is response to the instinct of *tadayyun* (religiousness). *Taqdees* has many aspects; the highest of which is the ‘ibadah (worship) with all of its kinds, such as submission, humbleness and humiliation (oneself to the worshipped). It includes regard and glorification. Due to this *taqdees*, the emotions are agitated strongly or weakly in accordance with the concepts that are linked with the emotions. This is because these concepts are responsible for determining the manner of *taqdees*, when it is done and when not. Therefore, distortion takes place in diverting the *taqdees* from some matters to others, as it occurs in the distortion of the *taqdees* of the Creator to the *taqdees* of the creatures. Distortion could occur in the manners of *taqdees*; so he (a Muslim) considers the kissing of the Qur’an as *taqdees* to it, even if he said or did at the same time, what contradicts with this *taqdees*; such as touching the Qur’an while not having wudu, or saying that Qur’an no more suits this time. So he made *taqdees* to the Qur’an by kissing it, even if he objected what the Qur’an said explicitly:

“No one touches it except the Muttaharoon.” [TMQ Al-Waqia:79]

Or he might disbelieved in it openly by saying that it is not suitable. Therefore, it was possible to remove the *taqdees* from some objects, whether to others, or implying that certain action is the only *taqdees* to these objects, while the other action is not *taqdees*, nor related to it and does not contradict it. This removal occurs by the distortion through changing the concepts. This is easy and all people can do it to those whose *taqdees* originates from the motive of their emotions. This is because it is easy to change the concepts associated with these emotions, for they are mostly instinctive concepts or submissive concepts that are easy to be removed. As regards to the *taqdees* that results from the thought associated with emotions agitated by the same thought, it is difficult to remove, though the efficient people can play with the thoughts and sentences, yet there will be great resistance before change occurs in this *taqdees*. Therefore, *taqdees* must be based on an intellectual motive associated with emotions, so as to be stable, and safe from falling in error or falsehood.

Taqdees per se, must be in the Muslims like the ‘aqeedah; it must originate from the mind; and by its nature, it originates from the motive of the ‘aqeedah, which is a rational ‘aqeedah. Therefore, it is necessary to be sure of who he sanctifies and what he sanctifies. However, once it is proved that it must be sanctified, then its *taqdees* would mean the rejection of discussion about it after its *taqdees* was proved to be authentic, except in case it is wished to convince the others of its *taqdees*. This is because the re-discussion and study of this matter after the validity of the *taqdees* was proved, contradicts the *taqdees*. This is similar to the re-discussion and study of the ‘aqeedah after its proof, which contradicts being an ‘aqeedah. The ‘aqeedah should be transformed from being a philosophy to become unquestionable; and the

taqdees has to change from an intellectual motive and a rational discussion to become unquestionable. Otherwise, the ‘aqeedah will not be crystallised in a man who keeps discussing it, nor the *taqdees* of a matter where discussion continues in its *taqdees*.

The Muslims realised rationally that the *taqdees* of Allah (swt) is worshipping Him, obedience of His orders, abstention from His forbiddances and submission and surrender to what came in His speech in the Glorious Qur’an. They also understood rationally that the *taqdees* of the Prophet (saw) is his glorification and veneration in all the situations, in all the matters of life, which is the absolute submission and surrender to what came in his (saw) authentic hadeeth, as being a revelation from Allah (swt). Thus, the *taqdees* of the Qur’an and the hadeeth was by an intellectual motive associated with emotions agitated by the same thought. Therefore, it is necessary that they are sanctified, and their *taqdees* must change to an unquestionable matter, that does not accept discussion, nor subject to study by those to whom the *taqdees* was proved. Anyone who tries to deviate the *taqdees* from the hadeeth to the Qur’an alone, his action would be kufr. Similarly, the one who considers the *taqdees* of the Qur’an is by kissing it while believing in its unsuitability for this time, his action will be kufr also. Rather, the *taqdees* must be complete and total glorification, submission and surrender; and no discussion regarding it should be accepted except in the case of convincing (others) of the origin of *taqdees*. Thereupon, man per se is created (by innate nature) to make *taqdees*, and it can’t be removed from him, though it can be suppressed or deviated.

As the rational ‘aqeedah of the Muslims determined to them whom they sanctify, and the things which they must sanctify, they as humans are created (their innate nature) to make *taqdees*. As the mind determined to Muslims the sanctities and the manner of their sanctifications, they can’t abandon the *taqdees* because it is a part of their creation; and they are not allowed to abandon the *taqdees* of the sanctities which Islam obliged them to sanctify, for it is of the requirements of their embrace of Islam. However, the enemies of Islam worked, through the distortion, to remove the *taqdees* from things that Islam obliged to be sanctified, and to change the meaning of the *taqdees* of the things when they failed to remove the *taqdees* from them. Thus, it is necessary that the aware people make the *taqdees* by Muslims result from the motives of the Islamic ‘aqeedah rationally, and to change this *taqdees* to become self-evident, so that every Muslim becomes capable to be at the frontier of Islam where it can’t be attacked from it.

‘Ismah of the Rasool

The *‘ismah* (infallibility) of the prophets and messengers is an issue stipulated by the mind. For the fact that he is a Prophet or a Messenger necessitates he is infallible in conveying from Allah (swt). If there is a defect of the possibility of the absence of *‘ismah* in one issue, then this defect would reach every issue; and then the whole prophethood and message would collapse. The proof that a person is a Prophet of Allah (swt) or a Messenger from Allah (swt) means he is infallible in regards to what he conveys from Allah (swt). So his infallibility in conveyance is inevitable, and the rejection of this infallibility is rejection of the message which he brought and the prophethood which he was sent with. As regards to his infallibility from doing the actions that disagree from the commands and prohibitions of Allah (swt), it is definite that he does not commit *kaba’ir* (major sins) definitely, so he does not commit any of the *kaba’ir* absolutely. This is because performing a major sin means committing a disobedience. Obedience is not partitioned and the disobedience is not partitioned. So if disobedience reach to the action, then it would reach the propagation (*tablaegh*), as matter which contradicts the message and prophethood. That is why the prophets and messengers were infallible from committing *kaba’ir*, the same way they are infallible in propagation from Allah (swt). As regards the infallibility regarding the *sacha’ir* (minor sins), the scholar had different views about it. Some of them said they are not infallible from them, for they are not disobedience; while others said they are infallible for they are disobedience. The true view about that is whatever its performance is considered haram and whatever its performance is considered obligatory, ie, all the duties (*furoodh*) and the prohibition (*muharraamat*), they are infallible regarding them. Thus they are infallible from neglect on the obligations and from committing the prohibitions, whether they were *kaba’ir* or *saha’ir*. In other words, they are infallible from anything called disobedience (*ma’siyah*). Other than that, like *khilaf-ul-awla* (opposite to what is most appropriate), they are not infallible from them. So, they might do what is opposite to the most appropriate, absolutely, for in all its aspects, it does not enter under the meaning of the word *ma’siyah* (disobedience). This is what is necessitated by the mind and required by the fact they are prophets and messengers.

Our master Mohammad (saw) is a Prophet and a Messenger. So, like the other messengers and prophets, he is infallible from making an error in what he conveys from Allah (swt). This is a definite infallibility proved by the rational and shar’i evidence. The Rasool (saw) did not convey the ahkam except from the *wahy* (revelation). Allah (swt) says in the Surah of Al-Anbiaa’:

“Say: I only warn you with the *wahy* (inspiration).” [TMQ Al-Anbiaa:45]

Allah (SWT) says in the Surah of An-Najm:

“Nor does he speak of (his own) desire. It is only inspiration that is inspired.”
[TMQ An-Najm:3/4]

The word ‘speak’ (*yantiq*) is of the generality (*umoom*) words, so it includes the Qur’an and others. There is nothing in the Qur’an or the Sunnah that specifies it in the Qur’an, so it remains general, meaning that everything he speaks of legislation is an inspired *wahy*. It is invalid to specify what he speaks to the Qur’an only; it must rather remain general, including the Qur’an and the hadeeth. As regards specifying it in to what he conveys from Allah (swt), in terms of legislation and others, of ahkam, creeds, thoughts and stories, without including the style, and means from drawing plans to battles, or dusting the palm trees or the like, this

is because he is a Messenger. Discussion is about a Messenger and study of what he was sent with and not in other than that. So the subject of the speech (of the Messenger) is what specifies. Thus the form of generality remains general in the subject it came with, and it is then considered a form of specification. This is due to His (swt) saying:

“Say: I only warn you with the wahy (inspiration).” [TMQ Al-Anbiaa:45]

It is also due to His (swt) saying in Surah of Sad:

“It is revealed to me only that I may be a plain warner.” [TMQ Sad:70]

It shows that the aim is what he brought of creeds, ahkam and everything he was ordered to convey and to warn with. Therefore, it does not include the use of styles or his natural actions which are of man’s innate nature (fitrah), ie from his natural creations, such as walking, speaking, eating etc. It is specified in the men’s actions and their thoughts, and not in the styles, the means and the like. So, whatever the Messenger (saw) was ordered to convey of what is related to the actions and thoughts of men, is revelation from Allah Al-Anbiaa. The wahy includes the speech and actions of the Rasool (saw) as well as his agreement (sukoot), because we are commanded to follow him. Allah (swt) says:

“Whatever the Rasool brought it to you, take it; and whatever he forbade you from, abstain from (it).” [TMQ Al-Hashr:7]

And He (swt) said:

“Verily, in the messenger of Allah you have a good example.” [TMQ Al-Ahzab:21]

Thus the speech, the action and the agreement of the Rasool (saw) are shar’i evidence, and they are all revelation from Allah (swt). Rasool Allah (saw) used to receive the revelation, conveys what the wahy brings to him from Allah (swt), and settles the matters in accordance with the wahy, without deviating from the wahy absolutely.

Allah (swt) said in Surat al-Ahqaaf:

“I only follow what is revealed to me.” [TMQ Al-Ahqaaf:9].

And He (SWT) said in Surat al-A’raaf:

“I only follow what is revealed to me from my Lord.” [TMQ Al-A’raaf :203].

This means, I don’t follow except that is revealed to me from my Lord. So he limited his adherence (*ittibaa’*) to that which is revealed to him from his Lord. All of this is explicit, clear and apparent to be general (*a’amm*); and what is related to the Rasool (saw) in regards to what he is ordered to convey is wahy (revelation) only. The Legislative life of the Rasool (saw) in explaining the ahkam to the people followed that approach. So, he (saw) used to wait for revelation in many of the ahkam, such as the *dhihar* (pre-Islamic form of divorce) and the *li’aan* (sworn allegation of adultery committed by the wife) and others. He never said of a hukm on an issue, or made any legislative action or made a legislative agreement, except based on a wahy from Allah (swt). The Sahabah would be confused sometimes between the hukm of one of human actions and the opinion regarding a matter, a means or a style, so they asked the Rasool (saw): “Is that wahy, O Rasool Allah, or it is the opinion and advice”: If he

said to them, it is *wahy*, they kept silent, for they knew it is not from him. If he said to them; it is rather the opinion and the advice, then they would discuss with him, and he might of followed their opinion; as what happened in (the battle of) Badr, the trench and Uhud. He sued to tell them in regards of other than what he conveys from his Lord: “You know better in regards of the matters of your dunya.”, as it was reported in the hadeeth of dusting the palm trees. Had he spoken in the matter of legislation without revelation, he would have not waited the revelation so as to say the hukm, and the Sahabah would have not asked him of whether that was a revelation or an opinion; he would have rather answered from himself, and they would have discussed with him without asking him. Therefore, the Rasool (saw) used not to start a speech, action or acceptance except based on *wahy* from Allah (swt), and not based on an opinion from him. He (saw) is also infallible from making error in everything he conveys from Allah (swt).

It is invalid on the part of the Rasool (saw) to be a Mujtahid

The Rasool (saw) never made *ijtihad*, nor it is right, by Shar'a and 'aql, for the Rasool (saw) to make *ijtihad*. The shar'i evidence is the explicit ayah that indicate in restricting everything the Rasool (saw) speaks of, warns with and follows with the *wahy*. Allah (swt) says:

"Say: I only warn you with the wahy." [TMQ Al-Anbiaa:45]

"I only follow what is revealed to me." [TMQ Al-Ahqaf:9]

"He never speaks of (his own) desire." [TMQ An-Najm:3]

As for the rational evidence, the Rasool (saw) used to wait for the revelation in regards to many ahkam despite the pressing need for presenting the hukm of Allah (swt). If he was allowed to make *ijtihad*, he would not have delayed the presentation of the hukm; he would rather make *ijtihad*. Since it was proved that he used to delay mentioning the hukm until the *wahy* came down, this indicated he is not allowed to make *ijtihad*, nor did he made *ijtihad*. Moreover, the Rasool, (saw) must be followed. So if he made *ijtihad*, then it was possible that he made a mistake; had he made a mistake, we must have to follow him, which entails the order to follow the error which is wrong. The possibility that the Rasool (saw) makes a mistake contradicts the message and prophethood. The acceptance of the message and prophethood necessitates the absence of mistake on the part of the Rasool and Prophet (saw), and necessitates the absence of error on his part in whatever he conveys from Allah (swt). Therefore, it is not allowed on the part of the Rasool (saw) to make *ijtihad* absolutely; and whatever he conveyed of ahkam, with his speech, action or acceptance, is only revelation from Allah (swt). It is not correct to say that Allah (swt) does not agree with him about the error, and He explains it to him quickly. This is because the error in the *ijtihad*, once it occurred from the Rasool (saw), it becomes obligatory upon the Muslims to follow him until the explanation (of the error) takes place. This explanation would give a new hukm other than the first one, and would order the Muslim to follow it and give up the first hukm which was wrong. This is false, and not allowed on the part of Allah (swt), nor the part of the Rasool (saw).

However, *ijtihad* did not take place from the Rasool (saw) in whatever he conveyed from Allah (swt), in any of the ahkam of Allah absolutely. What is rather proved in the text of the Qur'an and the authentic Sunnah that the Rasool (saw) used to convey from the *wahy*, and did not convey from other than the *wahy*. When the *wahy* did not come regarding an incident, he used to wait for it till it came down. As regards the ayah that they mentioned and they mentioned the Rasool (saw) made *ijtihad* in it, such as His (swt) saying:

"It is not (allowed) for any Prophet to have captives (or war) until he has made slaughter in the land." [TMQ Al-Anfal:67]

And His (swt) saying:

"Allah forgive you (O Mohammad)! Wherefore did you grant them leave."
[TMQ At-Tauba:43]

And His (swt) saying:

“And never (O Mohammad) pray for one of them who dies, nor stand by his grave.” [TMQ At-Tauba:84]

This is in addition to other similar ayah and ahadeeth. All of this was not a subject to *ijtihad* in a hukm and conveying it to the people, then retracting from it and correcting it in another hukm. It was rather a subject of blaming him for undertaking some actions. The Rasool (saw) did not convey a specific hukm and then the ayah came to show the error of the first hukm that he conveyed and made error in its *ijtihad*. Rather, the Rasool (saw) did an action as an implementation of the ahkam of Allah (swt) which the *wahy* brought down and he conveyed it to the people. Thus the hukm was legislated, it was ordered, and the Rasool (saw) had conveyed. In such an incident the Rasool (saw) carried out the action in accordance with the order of Allah (swt). However, he undertook it different to what is more appropriate, so he was only blamed for that. So the ayah are blame to the Rasool (saw) for doing different to what is more appropriate. They are not correction for his *ijtihad*, and nor for legislating another hukm different to a hukm that the Rasool (saw) made *ijtihad* in it. The wording (*mantooq*) and meaning (*mafhoom*) of the ayah indicate that His (swt) saying:

“It is not for any prophet to have captives until he has made slaughter in the land.” [TMQ Al-Anfal:67], indicates that taking captives was legal on condition that it was preceded with slaughter in the land. This understanding is supported by the ayah:

“Until when you have routed them make fast of bonds.” [TMQ Muhammad:4]

What is meant by *ithkhan* (routing, slaughtering) is the severe killing and intimidation. No doubt the Sahabah made great killing, in the Day of Badr, until they truly crushed their enemy. It is not a condition, in *ithkhan* in the land, to kill all the people. Moreover, they took some of the enemy as captives after the great killing. The ayah itself indicates it is allowed to have captives after the *ithkhan*. Thus, this ayah clearly indicates that taking captives was allowed according to this ayah. Thus, the Rasool (saw) did not make *ijtihad* in the hukm of the captives; and nor taking captives in Badr was an offence opposite to the hukm which the ayah brought. It rather indicates, regarding the application of the hukm of the captives in this incident, it was more appropriate that it was more killing, so that the *ithkhan* to be more apparent. So, the ayah was revealed to blame him over the implementation different to what is more appropriate. Thus, it is an ayah of blame, of one of the actions of the Rasool (saw), regarding an incident whose hukm is known, but he applied it different to what was actually more appropriate. So it is a blame on what is different to the more appropriate. The prophets are not infallible from doing what is different from the appropriate. Thus, it is possible on their part to do it; and once they did it, Allah (swt) blames them on it; so this is a blame to the Rasool (saw).

As regards His (swt) saying:

“Allah forgive you Wherefor did you grant them leave, till those who told the truth were manifest to you, and you did know the liars.” [TMQ At-Tauba:43], it does not indicate any *ijtihad*. This is because the Rasool (saw) is allowed to give permission, by the evidence of His (swt) saying in Surah An-Noor:

“So, if they you leave for some of their affairs, give leave to whom you will of them.” [TMQ An-Noor:62]

The ayah is explicit, and indicates the Rasool (saw) is allowed to give leave to them. However, in that incident, the battle of Tabook and the preparation of the army of hardship, it was more appropriate the Rasool (saw) did not give the hypocrites leave to stay behind. But when he gave them leave in that particular incident, Allah (swt) blamed him for that, ie, He (swt) blamed him (saw) for doing different to what is more appropriate. The ayah is not correcting an *ijtihad*, and nor legislating for a hukm different than a hukm that the Rasool (saw) made *ijtihad* in it in the same incident. It is only blame for doing other than what is more appropriate.

As for His (swt) saying:

"And never pray for one of them who died, nor stand by his grave. Lo! They disbelieved in Allah and His Messenger, and they died while they were evil-doers." [TMQ At-Tauba:84]

It came after His (swt) saying:

"If Allah bring you back (from the campaign) to a party of them and they ask of you a leave to go out (to fight), then say to them: You shall never more go out with me..." [TMQ At-Tauba:83]

Allah (swt) explained in this ayah that he should not allow them to accompany him in his campaigns in order to disappoint them and scare them. He (swt) explained in the next ayah: *"Do not pray on them..."* [TMQ At-Tauba:84], another thing regarding their humiliation. This was during the campaign against the hypocrites to destroy them. There is nothing in the ayah that indicates the Rasool (saw) made *ijtihad* in a hukm, and the ayah came to indicate different to it. It is rather an original initial legislation regarding the hypocrites, which goes in harmony with the ayah about the hypocrites which were repeated in the same Surah. There is nothing, neither explicitly (*sarahatan*), nor by indication (*dalatan*), wording (*mantooq*) or meaning (*mafهوم*), that shows the ayah to be correcting for an *ijtihad* or pointing to an error. This ayah was revealed in the ninth year of Hijrah after Tabook when Abu Bakr (ra) led the Muslims in Hajj. As regards to what was reported about the revelation of this ayah and the previous aayaat in terms of the context of revelation (*asbab un-nuzool*) and the related incidents, many of these reports are not authentic. What was proved to be authentic of the ahadeeth related to the *sabab un-nuzool* (cause of revelation), these are solitary, speculative (*ahad, thunni*), and they do not conflict with the definite (*qat'i*) which confines the conveyance of the ahkam by the Rasool (saw) to the *wahy* only, and he does not follow except the *wahy* and does not speak except with the *wahy*.

"I only follow what is revealed to me."

Accordingly, there is no indication in the mentioned ayah of the occurrence of *ijtihad* from the Rasool (saw). They have no legislation for a new hukm and nor correction for an old hukm. They rather contain blame to the Rasool (saw) on actions he did and whose ahkam were known through the *wahy* before he (saw) undertook them. The fact that the Rasool (saw) is a Mujtahid or allowed to make *ijtihad* is forbidden according to 'aql and shar'i. So it is not valid, on the part of the Rasool (saw) to make *ijtihad* in what he conveys from his Lord of ahkam, whether the conveyance was by speech, agreement or action. This is because the aayaat are definitely proved, and their meaning is definite, that he (saw) does not speak, follow, nor warn except by the *wahy*. Accordingly, it was not valid, on the part of the Rasool (saw) and all the messengers to make mistake in what they convey from Allah (swt), whether the error was due to *ijtihad*, forgetfulness or intentional, for this contradicts the necessary infallibility on their right.

Disciplines (Sciences) of Psychology, Society and Education

People mix-up between the inferred thoughts that result from the rational method (of thinking) and the scientific thoughts that result from the scientific method (of thinking). Due to this confusion, they consider psychology, sociology and education disciplines, as sciences. They consider their thoughts as scientific thoughts, for they resulted based on observations followed on children under different circumstances and different ages; or followed on different groups at different conditions; or on different actions of different people under different conditions. They called the repetition of these observations as experiments. The truth of the matter is that the thoughts of psychology, sociology and education are not scientific thoughts; they are rather rational thoughts. This is because the scientific experiments are the subjugation of the matter to conditions and factors other than its original condition and factors and the observation of the effect of that subjugation. In other words, it is carrying out of the experiments on the same matter, like the experiments of physics and chemistry. As regards the observation of a thing at different times and situations, it is not considered scientific experiments. Therefore, the observation of the child at different situations and different ages, and the observation of groups in different countries and at different circumstances, and the observation of actions from different people at different situations; all of that does not enter in the subject of scientific experiments, so it is not considered a scientific method. It is rather an observation, repetition of the observation and conclusion only. Thus, it is a rational method and not scientific method. Accordingly, the thoughts of so-called psychology, sociology and education sciences are rational thoughts, and they belong to the culture and not in the science.

Moreover, psychology, sociology and education sciences are speculative and subject to error; they are not of the definite matters. So, it is invalid to use them as a basis for judging on matters, nor it is allowed to use them as evidence for the validity or invalidity of matters. This is because they are not of the subject of scientific facts or scientific laws so as to say they are correct unless proved wrong. They are rather speculative information that came through speculation. Though they are concluded through the rational method, they are not of the subject of judging the existence of things, but rather of the subject of judging the reality of the thing. This sort of view is definitely speculative, and liable to error. Furthermore, these three disciplines: psychology, sociology and education sciences are built on erroneous bases, a matter that made many of the thoughts that they contain erroneous.

Psychology, in its generality, is build on its view towards the instincts and its view towards the brain. It views man to have many instincts, only some of them have been discovered, while others are not. Psychologists built on this view erroneous theories; a matter that led to the error that exists in many of the thoughts of psychology. Psychology views the brain divided into areas, where each area has a specific capability, and that some brains have powers not existent in their brains. Based on that, some people have capability to understand the languages, but not the mathematics. While others, in contrast to that, they have capability to understand mathematics but not the languages. Thus, there are erroneous theories that were built on this view. This, also, led to error in many of the thoughts of psychology.

The truth of the matter in all of this is that it is obscured by sensation through the following up the response, that man has a live energy that has two aspects: One of them requires the inevitable satisfaction, where man dies if it was not satisfied. The second requires satisfaction, but if it was not satisfied, man remains alive, though he feels pain and becomes worried due to the absence of satisfaction. The first aspect is represented in the organic needs

such as the hunger and thirst and answering to the nature's call. The second aspect is represented in the instincts, which are the religiousness instinct, the reproduction instincts and the survival instinct. These instincts are the feeling of deficiency, the feeling of the race survival and the feeling of the personal survival. There is nothing more than these three. Anything beside these three instincts are only aspects of the instincts, such as the fear, sovereignty and ownership are appearances of the survival instinct; reverence of the heroes and worship are appearances of the religiousness instinct; and the sexual inclination, fatherhood, motherhood and brotherhood are appearances of the procreation instinct. Thus, every one of the appearances belongs to one of these three instincts.

As regards the brain, the truth of the matter is that the brain is one and the same. Disparity and variance of the thoughts is due to the disparity and variance of the sensed matters and the previous information, and also due to the disparity of the power of linkage. There is no a capability that exists in one brain but does not exist in another. Rather, all the brains have the capability of thinking in every matter once the tangible reality, the senses, the previous information and the brain exist. The brains only vary in the power of linkage and the power of sensation, as the eyes vary in the power of sight, in strength and weakness, and as the ears vary in the power of hearing, in strength and weakness. Therefore, it is feasible to give everybody any information, and he/she has the capability to comprehend them. Accordingly, there is no basis to what came in the psychology of the capabilities in the brains or the same brain.

Thus, the wrong view of psychology to the instincts and the wrong view of psychology to the brain, led to the error of the theories that were built on that view.

As for sociology, it is, in its totality, based on its view towards the individual and the society, ie, it is based on its individualistic view. Thus, its view moves from the individual, to the family, to the group (community) and to the society, on the account that the society is consisted of individuals. So, the societies, in their view, is considered separate from each other, and what suits one of them does not suit the other society. The sociologists built on this view erroneous theories, that fundamentally led to the error of the thoughts of sociology. The truth of the matter is that society does not consist of individuals absolutely; for the individual together with another individual consist a group, but not a society. The group does not constitute a society unless permanent relationships developed amongst its individuals. If, however, relationships did not develop between its individuals, it would remain as a group. Accordingly, the presence of 1,000 persons as travellers in a ship, does not make of them a society; they rather remain as a group. However, the presence of 200 person in one village makes of them a society due to the permanent relationships between them. Thus, the presence of the permanent relationships amongst the group is what makes of them a society. So, the study of the society must be a study of the relationships and not the group. However, what initiates this relationship between the individuals is the instinct (*maslahah*) they have. So, if they had an interest to them, a relationship would develop; but if they had no interest to them, then relationships would not develop. The interest would not develop a relationship unless there existed in it three matters; firstly, the thought of the two sides is unified in considering it as interest. So, if one side considers it an interest while the other considers it bad (evil), then no relationship would develop between them. So, in order that the interest exists, each one of them has to view it as an interest. Secondly, the emotions about the interest must be unified over the interest. If both sides were delighted of it or both were angry of it, then a relationship would exist. If however, one of them was delighted of it, while the other was angry of it, then no relationship will exist from it. Thirdly, the system that regulates this interest (*maslahah*)

must be unified. So, if one of the two sides regulated the interest in accordance with a certain system, while the other side rejected that system, and regulated it in accordance with another system, then no interest would exist between them. Thus, the two sides must agree on the manner by which their interest is regulated. Accordingly, the society exists by the unification of the thoughts, emotions and the system between the individuals. However, these individuals would generate a system, specific to them. If they, however, wished to annex other individuals from other societies, then they have to refute the thoughts, emotions and systems acceptable to all of them, so as to make a society. Therefore, defining the society as individuals does not apply to the ideological society; it rather applies to a specific society. While the true meaning of society is that it is composed of man, thoughts, emotions and the systems. What is good to man in a certain place, in terms of the thoughts, emotions and systems is suitable for man in every place; and it changes the various societies to the same society, which is reformed by the thoughts, emotions and systems. The difference between the individual and man, is that when you study Mohammad, Khalid or Hasan, in regards to the characters which are not shared naturally by human beings, then you would have studied him as an individual. If, however, you studied Mohammad, Khalid or Hasan, in terms of what he has of natural characters that exist naturally in human beings, then you would have studied him as a human being, though you studied specific individuals. Thus, the reform of the society has to be radical, though it is by studying the society, in its capacity as humans, thoughts, emotions and systems, and not as individuals. So, the view has to be a human outlook and not an individual outlook, even if the study was for a particular individual.

This is the definition of the society; this is the correct view towards it; and this is the reality of the society, the reality of the group (*jama'ah*) and the reality of the individual. It thus becomes obvious that the error of the view of the society led to the error of the theories, and the error of sociology as a whole. In regards to what came in the sociology about the group (*jama'ah*), that its understanding of the matters is generally weaker than the individual's understanding, and it is easier to be agitated emotionally than the individual. The correctness of this view does not result from the view about the society. It rather results from the prevalence of the numerous and frequent information over the individual information, thus leading to influence the view on reality. It also results from the fact that the aspect of the **crowd** that appear in the group agitates the emotions, for it is one of the appearances of the survival instinct. Accordingly, everything that is built on the view about the society is false; and whatever is correct of it, its correctness does not result from its view to the society, but from another reason. Therefore, sociology is invalid, because it is built upon a false view, that is the view towards the society and the individual.

As for the education sciences, they are built on psychology, and affected by the sociology theories, and result from the observation of the actions of the individuals and the conditions of the children. This makes the education sciences contain the right and the wrong at the same time. Whatever is built on psychology, and affected by sociology is invalid. Thus, invalidity led to false educational thoughts that led to the corruption of the syllabuses and methods of teaching. Considering the child not capable for some disciplines while capable for others is false. Therefore, dividing the teaching into scientific and literary, and allowing the person to choose what he studies based on his capability is of the most false views. This is contrary to the reality and harmful to the Ummah. Considering the person not capable to learn some disciplines, while capable to learn others, is also false, which led to deprive some people from studying some disciplines and deprived many people from continuing study. In regards to the education sciences that are built on the observation of the children and the observation of individuals actions under different situations and conditions, whatever of these

that agrees with the reality, it would be correct. This is like tiredness, relax, intellectual activity and the like; this in general, is correct. Whatever of these that disagrees with the reality such dividing the year into four seasons, and giving the student a holiday of four months, the exams and the like; all of these are, as a whole, wrong. This is what caused the error of education theories, the falsehood of education sciences in general, but particularly that built on psychology and affected by sociology.

The Scientific Method and the Rational Method.

The scientific method is a specific manner in study used in order to arrive at comprehending the reality of the object under study, through carrying out of experiments on it. It does not take place except in the study of the tangible objects; and it is not possible to occur in the thoughts. It works through the subjugation of the matter to conditions and factors other than its original conditions and factors; the observations of the matter, the original conditions and factors and those it was subjected to; then a tangible physical truth about the matter is concluded from this process, as it is the case in the laboratories. This method obliges the abandonment of all the previous information about the object matter under study, and the assumption of their absence; then it starts to observe the object matter and experimenting it. This is because it requires from you, when making study, to remove from yourself any previous opinion or conviction you have already about the subject. Then you start the experiment and the observation, followed by the comparison, arrangement and conclusion based on these scientific premises. The concluded result is a scientific result, which is naturally subject to study and scrutiny. However, it remains to be a scientific one unless the scientific research proves error to have crept in one of its aspects. Though the results reached by the researcher, based on the scientific method, is called a scientific fact or a scientific rule, it is not, however, definite; it is rather susceptible to error. This possibility of error in the scientific method is one of its basic principles which must be noticed, as it is established in the scientific study. Error has actually happened in its results, and this appeared in many of the scientific disciplines which were proved to be invalid, after they were called as scientific facts. As an example, it was claimed the atom to be the smallest part in the matter, and it is indivisible. However the error of that was proved, and by the scientific method itself, it appeared it can be divided.

Therefore, the scientific method is specific to the object matter; because one of its basic principles is to carry out experiment on the matter, by subjecting it to conditions and factors different to its original ones. This process would not be possible in the thought, for it is not possible to carry out an experiment on it. Accordingly, the results concluded by the scientific method are only speculative and not definite, for they are susceptible to error.

As for the rational method, it is specific manner of study, which is followed to understand the reality of the matter under study, through transferring the sensation to the brain by means of the senses, and the presence of previous information by which the reality is explained, and thus the brain issues its judgement on it. This judgement is the thought, or rational comprehension. It works in the study of the tangible matters and the thoughts. It is the natural method to reach to understanding per se. Through its process the comprehension of matters takes place, and it is itself equivalent to the definition of the mind. Through its approach man, as a man, reaches to understand anything he already comprehended it, or he wants to comprehend.

However, the result reached by the researcher through the rational method has to be examined. If the result is a judgement on the existence of the matter, then it is definite, without any possibility of error in it absolutely. This is because the judgement was reached by the means of sensation of the reality; where sensation can't at all make error of the existence of the reality; for the sensation of the senses about the existence of the reality is definite. Thus the judgement issued by the mind about the existence of the reality, through this method, is definite. As for the deception that occurs, where the sensation mistakes, such as seeing the mirage thinking it is water, and seeing the straight pen placed in a glass of water, broken or

bend. This is not an error about the existence of the reality; it is rather error in the attributes of the reality. So the sensation did not make error about the existence of the thing, which is the mirage or the pen. The error is rather in the description of the thing. So it said about the mirage to be water, and about the straight pen to be broken or bent. Thus, in all things, whatever deception that might occur in them, the sensation is not possible to make error about their existence. Accordingly, when the brain senses of the existence of something, then this things exists definitely; and the judgement of its existence is definite. However, if the result of the rational method is the judgement on the reality of the thing or its description, then the result is speculative and subject to error. This is because this judgement causes by the way of the information, or the analysis of the sensed reality together with the information, which are possible to error. However, the result remains to be considered a correct thought until an error in it is proved. It is only at that time, it is judged to be wrong; but before that it remains to be correct result and valid thought.

As for the logic discussion, it is not a method for thinking. It is rather one of the styles that are based on the rational method. This is because the logical study is to build a thought on another thought where it ends with the sensation, and to reach, through this process, to a certain result, such as: The writing board is wooden, every wood burns; so the result is that the writing board can burn. Another example is: If there were life in the slaughtered sheep it would have moved; but it did not move; so the result is that there is no life in the slaughtered sheep. Thus, in the first example, the thought of that every wood burns was linked to the thought of the writing board is of wood. It was concluded from this linkage (of the two thoughts) that the writing board can burn. In the second example, the thought that the slaughtered sheep did not move, was linked with the thought that life in the sheep makes it move. It resulted from this linkage that the slaughtered sheep has no life. In this logical discussion, if its premises that contain its cases were correct, then the result will be correct. If they, however, were incorrect, the result will be wrong. The condition of these premises is that each one of them should end with sensation. Therefore, they are traceable to the rational method, and the sensation judges on them so as to understand their validity. Thus, the premises (of the logical study) are one of the styles that are based on the rational method, and they are subject to falsehood and deception. Instead of judging on the logic by reference to the rational method, it is preferable to use the rational method in study, from the start, without the need of using the logical style. This is despite that it can be used if its premises were correct, by referring them to the rational method. Accordingly, thinking has two methods only, which are the scientific method and the rational method. The first one obliges the abandonment of the previous information, while the other necessitates the presence of the previous information. The rational method is the basis in thinking, and thought generates by it only. Without it, thought can't generate, nor the scientific method or the logical style or other can exist. By the means of the rational method the scientific facts can be understood, through the observation, experiment and conclusion. By its means, the logical facts in logic and its like can be comprehended. By it, the facts of history can be understood, and the right from the wrong can be distinguished. By it the collective thought about the universe, man and life can exist with man, beside the facts of the universe, man and life. As for the scientific method, it can't exist, nor it is possible to exist unless it is built on the rational method and on what is proved by the rational method. So it is natural and inevitable that it should not be basis for thinking. Moreover, the scientific method decides that anything which is not tangible has no presence in the view of the scientific method. Thus, there is no existence of logic and history and their like, for this was not proved scientifically. In other words, they were not proved through the observation of the matter, experimenting it and the material conclusion of the tangible things. This is preposterous error, for the physical disciplines are

one of the branches of information, and one of the thoughts, beside the other many disciplines of life, which were not proved by the scientific method, but rather by the rational method. Therefore, the scientific method is not allowed to be taken as a basis for thinking. What must be taken as a basis for thinking is the rational method only.

This, however, does not mean that the scientific method is erroneous; but rather taking it as a basis for thinking is wrong. This is because it is not possible to be taken as a basis, for it is not a basis to build on; it is rather a branch that is build on an origin; and because taking it as a basis would exclude many disciplines and facts from study. This would lead to judge by the absence of many disciplines which are studied, and which contain facts; this is despite their actual existence, and they are sensed by sensation and reality.

Moreover, the scientific method is speculative and susceptible to error, in its view, is one of the bases that must be taken into consideration. Thus, it is not allowed to be taken as a basis for thinking. This is because the scientific method generates a speculative result about the existence of the thing and its attribute. While the rational method gives a definite result about the existence of the thing and specific attributes of it. Though it produces speculative result about the reality of the thing and the reality of its description, but, in regard to its judgement on the existence of the thing and the existence of certain attributes to it, it is definite and certain. Thus, it must be taken as a basis for study, on the account that its results are definite. Therefore, if a rational result was in conflict with a scientific result, about the existence of the thing and about the existence of a certain attribute to it, then the rational result has to be definitely taken. While the scientific result that contradicts with the rational result is ignored, because the definite is taken and not the speculative.

Therefore, the error that exists in the world, is its adoption of the scientific method as a basis for thinking, and making it as a criterion in the judgement on things. This error must be corrected, and the rational method must become the basis for thinking, and the reference for judging on things.

Political Awareness

Comprehension of the political situations, the international position or the political events is different from the political awareness. This is because the comprehension of the political situations or the political position or the political events is meditation on contemplation of them. As for the political awareness, it is man's contemplation to look after his affairs. The political awareness is the view towards the world from a specific angle. The outlook towards the world from other a particular angle is considered shallowness, and not political awareness. The outlook towards the domestic only is considered triviality, and not political awareness. The political awareness will not exist unless it fulfilled two elements. Firstly, the outlook must be towards the world. Secondly, this outlook must emanate from a defined particular angle, whatever was this angle, it was a particular ideology or a specific idea/thought. However, if the particular angle was an ideology, it would make the political awareness constant, proceeding with all of its objectives towards one goal, not deviated from it. The political awareness would then be deep-rooted and concentrated, not in the individuals only, but also in the Ummah.

The political awareness necessitates naturally the indulge in struggle for the sake of forming in man a particular concept about life, in his capacity as man, everywhere. The formation of this concept is the prime responsibility brought on the shoulder of the political aware person, who will not find rest except in spending effort for undertaking it.

It is necessary that the political aware person indulges in struggle against all inclinations that contradict his course, and against all the concepts that contradict his concepts at the same time in which he struggles to concentrate his concepts and implant his inclinations. Both must not separate from each other in struggle, even a hair breadth. This struggle includes that which is against the accusations that attack his view about life, and against the deep-rooted concepts that developed during the declined times. It is also a struggle against the capitalist influence that affects him though achieving the immediate demands; and against summarising the major objectives into partial ones.

Political awareness does not mean to fully understand the world nor the ideology or what must be taken as a specific angle for the outlook towards the world. It rather means the view should be toward the world, regardless of the amount of his information about it. This outlook has also to be from a specific angle, regardless of the degree of his knowledge of that angle. The mere existence of the outlook towards the world from a specific angle, indicates of the existence of the political awareness. Though this awareness varies, in terms of strength or weakness, with the information about the world and the angle. This is because what is intended of the outlook towards the world is concentrated in the outlook to man who lives in the world. What is also meant by the specific angle is concentrated in his concept about life which he took as a specific angle. Therefore, political awareness is specific to the politicians and thinkers. It is rather general and can be generated amongst the ordinary people and the unlettered ones, as it can be generated in the scholars and educated people. It must, rather, be generated, even in general, in the Ummah as a whole. This is because without this political awareness in the Ummah, even in every individual, it is not possible to understand the value of the thoughts he has in the life of the Ummah.

Political awareness is the pressing need which it is indispensable to achieve and secure in the Islamic Ummah. Without this political awareness it is not possible to understand the value of Islam in the life of individuals and society. It would not also be possible, without it, to

guarantee the march of the Ummah together with the d'awah carriers who struggle against the kufr and against the colonisation, in a constant way, and under all the circumstances, whether victory or defeat.

Without the political awareness the virtues of Islam will be suspended. Without the political awareness the situation of the Ummah will deteriorate, the means of revival will be cut off from her, and all the efforts spent in her revival will be wasted. Without political awareness amongst Muslims as Muslims, Islam will quickly disappear and the danger of annihilation of Muslims will increase, and the methods and means that enable the resuming of Islamic way of life and delivering the Islamic da'wah will be lost. Thus, the existence of the political awareness is a matter of ultimate necessity to the Islamic Ummah; and without exaggeration, it is a vital issue (an issue of life and death).

The presence of some individuals in the Ummah, who are furnished with political awareness does not protect the Ummah from the catastrophe, nor protects her from drifting, no matter how many were the aware individuals in the Ummah, as long as they were individuals. For the catastrophe would necessarily sweep them with the Ummah, and they would see her drift and suffer the pain of that drift. It is rather necessary that the political awareness exists in the Ummah as a whole, though it is not necessary to exist in all of her.

Therefore, the greatest effort should be spent in creating political awareness in the Ummah, equivalent to the effort spent in generating the Islamic concepts and agitating the Islamic emotions. Generating the world's feeling of the need of Islam for its guidance must emanate from the feeling of the Ummah of the need of Islam; and this feeling must be developed by the people's understanding of Islam and agitating their emotions for it. In other words, effort must be spent so that the Ummah looks at the world from the angle of Islam, so as this view is concentrated in the masses, even generally; and this basis must be taken into account when the effort is spent for explaining Islam and agitating the yearning to it.

The first thing that has to be noticed is that the awareness that gives fruit is distinguished by a comprehensive view to the benefit of the world from the angle of Islam. The Ummah, as a whole, must believe that saving the world without Islam is impossible. The Ummah must understand, even generally, that generating Islam in the domain of life in society without the Islamic State is imagination. It must be clear for those in whom the political awareness developed and flourished, that establishing the Islamic State without the Islamic Ummah is illusion and making the Ummah establish the Islamic State without political awareness is more fancy and illusion.

Political awareness emerges in the Ummah when its outlook to the world from the angle of Islam appeared. However, political awareness in the individual does not emerge unless this awareness developed and flourished in him. Thus, it is difficult to notice the political awareness in the individual, if this awareness was not manifested in him in a quite obvious way. The political aware person can't be influenced by the words, names and titles, and he takes his guard lest his mind becomes prey to propaganda and publicity.

He avoids neglecting the events or errs in searching the truth in the goal he works for. The advantage of the political aware person is the alertness in taking the news and opinions, lest something, whatever trivial it is, sticks to them. He has to take everything while full aware of that, and while thinking of his reality and his place from the goal which he works for.

The political aware person should take his guard against the influence of his inclinations on the opinions and news. This is because the one's self desires for a personal, or partisan or ideological matter might explain the opinion or the news, or might attach to it that which makes the observer think that it is true when it is false, or he might imagine that it is false when it is true. Therefore, the political aware person must understand the speech spoken and the action done. It is not enough that he comprehends that. Rather, the political aware person is the one who understands the matters and conveys them to the people so as they are places for study and discussion, and so as to work for creating awareness amongst the Ummah as a whole; thus she becomes used not to be influenced by words, and becomes used to examine the opinions and news.

It is not right to consider a person as political aware if he said something but acted opposite to it; or he holds an view but does not work hard to implement it. The conviction of the aware person in an ideology or a thought, politically, is manifested in his actions and not in his speeches, writings, talks or discussions. If his thoughts are not manifested in actions and results, it is valid for him and others to have doubt in his awareness, or at least in the validity of his awareness.

The aware people, whether they were individuals, groups or an organisation, their awareness will not be proved except by action, and their credibility will not appear except by daring and sacrifice. This is the distinguishing mark of the correct political awareness for the fact that it is awareness means it is contemplation; and the fact that it is political means it looks at all of his affairs and the affairs of his Ummah, based on this awareness. Therefore, the contact of the aware people with the issues, in their contact with the reality and the people and the direct life problems is inevitable; with no difference between the domestic level or the world international level. In this conflict, the ability is manifested in making the message which the aware person conveys or the special angle by which he looks at the world, as the basis and as the reference, and the goal which he strives to. There is no difference in that between the individuals and the Ummah. The action of the Ummah in accordance with what the special angle, from which it looks at the world, requires is inevitable like the activity of the individual; and her conviction of it (the special angle) is also inevitable like the individual. Her contact with the issues and with the problems is also inevitable like it is for the individual, so that it becomes valid to consider the political awareness existent in her. Therefore, it is necessary that three qualities be deep-rooted in the Ummah as one group, which are: Firstly: Concern about the affairs of the Ummah in a complete way. Thus, the Muslims says in his du'a: "May Allah have mercy on the Islamic Ummah.", the same way he says: "May Allah have mercy on me," He should be used to ask if the Islamic army won the battle before he asks about his son in the army.

Secondly: The unity of opinion and order towards what must be destroyed; and towards what must be supported of thoughts, actions and people, ie towards what must be built and what must be destroyed.

Thirdly: Making the obedience as one of the natural disposition; and the rebellion as an ugly and reprehensible vice. Subjection to the enemy is not considered obedience, nor the resistance of oppression is considered rebellion. Rather, obedience is the execution of the order of the competent authority with submission, desire, consent and tranquillity; while rebellion is the opposite of that.

Spiritual Power is the most effective

Man rushes to undertake an action in accordance of the power he has. His rush will be greater when his power is greater. The amount of what he achieves of actions is in accordance with what he has of power. However, man has many powers manifested in his body and the means he uses to satisfy his desires. He has semantic powers manifested in the semantic qualities which he aims to be qualified with. He as well, owns spiritual powers manifested in his understanding of his relationship with Allah (swt), or his feeling of it or of both of them. Each one of these three powers has an effect in man's performance of action. However, these powers are not equal to each other in the influence on man. They rather vary in influence on man. The materialistic power is the weakest in effect, while the semantic powers are of more effect than the materialistic powers. However, the spiritual powers are the greatest and strongest in effectiveness. This is because the materialistic powers, in terms of a body or a means, drive to satisfy the desire of their owner for action in accordance to his evaluation of these powers, but not more than that. They might even not drive him to work at all, though he has such powers, for he does not find a need to such work. Thus, they are power of limited motivation; and their existence alone does not necessitate the rush to work. So, when man wants to fight against his enemy, he assesses his physical powers and studies his materialistic means. If he found them enough to fight his enemy, he engaged in it, otherwise he turned away and retreated. He might find his powers enough to crush his enemy, but he imagines his enemy might defeat him by seeking the help of the one who is more powerful than him, so he shrinks from fighting; or his might consider it is better to use his powers for the sake of his comfort or to raise his standard of living, so he refrains from fighting. Thus, man wants to fight his enemy; but since he wanted to venture in that in accordance with what he has of materialistic powers, his venture became limited with these powers. He then became hesitant in undertaking the action, despite he has such powers, when an obstacle got in his way and raised in him cowardice or reluctance. This is different to the semantic powers, which first generates in his soul the tendency to undertake the action, then he strived to obtain the necessary powers to undertake the action, without limiting himself to the level of his existing powers. Man might venture with the semantic powers to do more than he usually does with his materialistic powers, or he might limit himself with the size of powers he reached to. Anyhow, semantic powers achieves more than the available materialistic powers. This is like the example of the one who fights against his enemy to liberate himself from his domination, or who fights to take revenge, or fights for reputation, or fights to help the weak or the like. Such a person rushes more than the one who fights against his enemy for a benefit, colonisation or for domination only, and the like. The reason of this is that the semantic powers are an internal motivation linked with concepts which are superior to the instinctual concepts; and this motivation requires a specific satisfaction. Thus these powers rush to generate the means of this satisfaction, so they dominate over the instinctual concepts and control over the materialistic powers. Accordingly, these powers gain such force that exceeds the materialistic powers. This explains the concern of the world states in generating the semantic powers among their armies beside supplementing the materialistic powers.

As for the spiritual powers, they are of greater effect in man from the semantic and materialistic powers. This is because the spiritual powers emanate from man's realisation of his relationship with Allah (swt), the Creator of the world and the Creator of forces. This rational realisation or emotional feeling of this relationship with Allah (swt), makes man rush to the same extent of what the Creator demands of him; and not to the extent of what he has of powers, nor to the extent of what he can collect of powers. It is rather at the extent of what He (swt) demands from him, regardless of whether this demand was at the extent of his

powers, or more or less. The demand might be offering his life explicitly, or it might lead to offering his life. He would carry out the work, even if it was bigger than what he has of powers, and more than what he collects of powers. Therefore, the spiritual powers are of greater effect than all the powers man has. However, if the spiritual powers emulate from sentimental emotion only, then there is fear that they may decline and change because of being dominated by other emotions or being deviated, through deception, to actions other than they were venturing to achieve. Thus, it is necessary the spiritual powers emanate from definite comprehension and feeling of man's relationship with Allah (swt). In such situation, these powers become well established, and their inclination will rush, without hesitance, to the same extent requested of them.

Once the spiritual powers existed, there would be no effect to the semantic powers, because man would not then carry out the action, motivated by them, rather motivated only by the spiritual powers. Man would not then fight against his enemy for the sake of a benefit, nor for the pride of victory. He rather fights against him because Allah (swt) commanded him of that, whether there was a booty or not; gained the pride of victory or nobody knew of that victory. This is because he did not undertake the work except because Allah (swt) commanded him of that. As for the materialistic powers, they would become then means for work and not motivating power for it.

Islam gave concern to make the motivating powers of man spiritual ones, even if their appearances are materialistic or semantic. For Islam made the spiritual basis as the only basis for the whole life. Thus Islam made the Islamic 'aqeedah the basis of his life; the halal and haram the criterion of his actions; and the attainment of the good pleasure of Allah (swt) the ultimate goal he strives for. It obliged him to carry out all his actions, their minor and major, in accordance with the order and prohibitions of Allah (swt) based on his realisation of his relationship with Him (swt). The realisation of the relationship with Allah (swt) and the feeling of it in a certain way, is the basis upon which the life of Muslim is built. This also represents the powers that motivate him to carry out any action, whether little or big. It is indeed the soul (*rooh*) by which his worldly life is founded in all his actions. The value of the spiritual powers he has will be as much as he has of that realisation and feeling (of his relationship with Allah). Therefore, it is obligatory upon Muslim to make his power spiritual ones, for they are his inexhaustible treasure, and the secret of his success and victory.

The Intellectual Style and the Literary Style

The style of writing is meaning arranged in ordered words. Or it is the manner of expression to portray what exists in the soul of the speaker of meanings, put in linguistic expressions. Though the linguistic picture is what appears in the style, it however does not stand independent of the meanings. Rather the credit of its apparent linguistic order is due to another order of meanings that was classified and harmonised inside the writer or the speaker; and it thus became a specific style; then the linguistic harmony was formed according to it simile, and it became the dress it clothed. They style requires from the writer or the speaker to understand what he wants to present in a very clear and accurate way. Then he does his best to present it as it is. This would have great effect on the value of the style. After that, the linguistic expression comes, where the author requires linguistic wealth and ability in using the constitutions (settings) and phrases, and the manner by which he wants to present the thoughts. The style requires also from the author to be himself influenced and agitated, he understood the facts and intended to announce them. He must stimulate his mind, emotions and imagination so as to understand the meaning strongly. The next step will be the power of expression, by choosing the words that convey the meanings in a way that match the meaning. Thus, the gentle word is used to convey the gentle meaning, while the strong word is used to convey the strong meaning. Moreover, the style requires from the writer or the speaker to understand what exists in the meanings of depth and enlightenment and what is attached to them of beautiful secrets in a vivid and magnificent way. Then he chooses the present and fittest phrases that suit this beautiful imagination or wonderful meaning, avoiding the rough and incongruous words that hurt the sensation and taste.

This is the style and what it requires. It appears from it that what is meant of writing or speaking is the conveyance of the meanings, that the writer and speaker have, to the reader and listener. Thus, the primary objective of expressions is only the meanings, then what comes next is the words that convey these meanings as they exist in the writer or speaker. Therefore, the matter is confined to two matters: The meanings and the words by which these meanings are conveyed. Due to this, there is a difference between the attention of the writers and speakers to the meanings and words. Some of them focused their attention to the meanings first, then they subjected the words to convey them accurately. While others focuses their attention to the words first and he compromised the accuracy of the conveyance of the meanings for the sake of the words. Therefore, the style of writing and speaking was divided into two: One of them is intellectual, while the other is literary. Each of them has a special texture different from the other. In the intellectual style, the writer or the speaker chooses the thoughts which he wants to convey due to their novelty, value or requirement of the circumstance. Then he arranges these thoughts in a rational way so that this becomes more conducive to understanding them and their good liason in the mind of the reader. Finally, he expresses them by the words suitable for them. In the intellectual style, the agitation is natural and fundamental and emanates from honest soul; the rational information are the primary fundament in its structure; and the artificial agitation does not appear in it. Its attention is the scrutiny of the thoughts; and it is the language of the mind. Its objective is to convey the facts for the aim of teaching, serving the information and enlightening the minds. Its expression is distinguished with the accuracy, identification and through examination. In principle, it is founded on the mind, propagating of the intellectual facts and information whose development requires effort and depth. In general, it is consisted of two fundamental elements: The first is the thoughts and the other is the expression. In the literary style, we find the writer or the speaker does not stop at the facts and information, and does not make his aim to provide the mind with thoughts. He rather brings them closer to comprehension, and

selects the most important and prominent of them, in which he finds an aspect of open or hidden beauty, or he alludes to an admonition or a reflection, or he calls for thinking or action. Then he explains what he selected in a way specific to him, where he imports on it from his wondering, admonished, content of discontent soul. Then he tries to carry this excitement, or stimulate the like of it to the souls of the readers and listeners, so as to become wondering, delighted, content or discontent. The literary style has the skill or excitement in the meanings and the words by which he conveys his thoughts. The attention in it is focussed on the force of excitement, and it is the language of the sentiment and the emotions. The aim in it is to arouse the readers and listeners by presenting the facts in a beautiful and magnificent way as the writer views them, or as how the listeners and readers must view them. He aims in it that his expression is characterised by splendour, generality and touching the places of beauty and action. He is characterised with the strength of sentiment that affects his expression in an obvious way, such that it appears in the words, representation and structures. This style is generally composed of these elements: Firstly, the thoughts. Secondly, the representations which he forms, and thirdly, the expressions by which he moulds the thoughts and representations. As for the strength, clarity and beauty of the style, they exist in the intellectual as well as the literary style, and they are not designated to a specific style. So they are characteristic of the style, whether it is literary or intellectual. Therefore, we find in many intellectual styles, the clarity, beauty and strength of the style greatly exceed in effect that which exists in the literary styles. The intellectual style is necessary to teach the thoughts to the people, and explaining them and generating in them the conviction in these thoughts. This can't be performed except with the intellectual style. It also serves to arouse the emotions so as to act upon the thoughts which he understood. However, its agitation is slow and it needs to comprehend the thought so as the emotions are agitated. However, the emotions founded by this style are permanent; and they do not die down unless he lost conviction in the thought which provoked them. This is different to the literary style; it does not benefit except in provoking the emotions. It is necessary to provoke people to action. Though it teaches fact to the listener and reader, but it teaches the shallow facts and the trivial information. It is not capable to convey the deep thoughts. If it tried to do so, it simplifies them, inflates them and deals with them freely, so their depth and meanings are lost and thus they become absurd. Therefore, the thoughts of the ideologies, philosophy, legislation and **experical** experiments and the like can't be conveyed except with the intellectual style. While the poetry, speech and the like can't be conveyed except with the literary style. The intellectual style is necessary to convey the thought, and the literary style is necessary to provoke people and incite them to work required from them. Thus we find the intellectual style spread in the Ummah when she is revived and at the time of her vigorous ascent. While the literary style spreads in the Ummah when she is shallow in thinking or lives in **lisenry**. Therefore, we find in the time in which our master Mohammad (saw) was sent, the poetry declined, and the literary prose diminished, while the intellectual style spread in the speeches and ahadeeth. The Qur'an was the most glorious example in the intellectual thought; and most of it was of that style, though it contained the most wonderful things found in the literary style, but it observes what is necessary in the intellectual style in terms of accuracy and identification.

The feelings of the revival advanced in the Islamic Ummah at this time, so she is in need of the intellectual style to convey the facts to the people, and to make their emotions provoked for action upon them permanent, yet we can't dispense with the literary style in provoking the people for action, but after we put the thought, which we want them to act upon, in their minds and strengthen their conviction in it.

(152)