

**Refutation of Western
Capitalist Thought as an
Ideology, Civilization and
Culture**

(Translated from Arabic)

**Refutation of Western
Capitalist Thought as an
Ideology, Civilization and
Culture**

(Translated from Arabic)

**Issued by
Hizb ut Tahrir**

**Issued by
Hizb ut Tahrir**

**1st Edition
Safar 1443 AH
September 2021 CE**

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

﴿وَقُلْ جَاءَ الْحَقُّ وَزَهَقَ الْبَاطِلُ﴾

﴿إِنَّ الْبَاطِلَ كَانَ زَهُوقًا﴾

“And declare, ‘The truth has come, and falsehood has perished. Indeed, falsehood is bound to perish.’”

[TMQ Surah Al-Isra’a 17:81]

Contents

Contents	6
Preface	8
An Introduction to Western Capitalist Thought: Its Origin, Essence and Refutation	12
Emergence of Western Thought	14
Essence of Western Thought	23
Refutation of the Method of Western Thinking	30
Reason and Rationalism	31
Science and the Scientific Method	46
About the Concept of Truth	56
Refuting the Creed of Western Civilization	62
The Falsity of Secularism as a Creed	68
The Falsity of Secularism as an Intellectual Basis	80
The Falsity of Secularism as an Intellectual Leadership	84
Refuting the Western Method in Propagating its Ideology	86
The Method of Capitalists in Propagating their ideology ...	87
Historical Background of Western Colonialism	89
Intellectual Background of Western Colonialism	91
Refuting the Colonialist Method of the West	92
Refuting the Western Capitalist System	95
Refuting the Capitalist Economic System	97

1- The economic material	99
2- Freedom of Ownership (Private Property).....	102
3- The Concept of Production.....	105
4- The Economic Problem	106
Refuting the Democratic Ruling/governing System	110
Refuting the Western Social System.....	128
1- The View Toward Man and Woman	132
2- Sexual Relations	142
Refuting the most Important Concepts of Western Civilization	150
Refuting the Idea of Individualism.....	151
Refuting the Idea of Freedom	162
The Summary and Salvation	171

Preface

The development of Western thought was completed in the nineteenth century CE (13th century AH). It transformed then from mere ideas and theories of its pioneers, into a comprehensive ideology, with its own creed, system and civilizational and cultural perceptions; it collectively came to be known as the capitalist ideology. It was adopted by Western European nations, who carried it to the world, including the Islamic World, through the method of colonialization. Headed by the superpower of the time, Britain, the Western nations were able to destabilize the Islamic Khilafah (the Ottoman Caliphate). At that time, the Khilafah's cultural development had stagnated and Muslims had ceased to think productively. Thus, parts of the Islamic Khilafah were lost to occupation, whilst its global political influence waned, until it became known as the "Sick Old Man," who was waiting for the world to announce his death. This actually happened at the beginning of the twentieth century CE (fourteenth century AH), that is, in the year 1924 CE, when the Islamic Khilafah state was officially abolished. With its fall, Islam is no longer present in the global political arena as an ideology, carried by a state, although it remains existent in the world, carried by individuals and peoples.

The end of the twentieth century CE did not just witness the fall of a great power i.e., the fall of the Islamic Khilafah. It also witnessed the emergence of another major power established upon an ideology that contradicts capitalism, both in its creed and system, even though it

emerged from within the core of Western thought itself. The communist ideology was born out of the West's materialistic enlightenment, raised and groomed within its cultural atmosphere. In the year 1917 CE, the Soviet Union was established upon the idea of Marxist socialism. Thus, communism appeared on the global political arena, as an ideology, carried by a state. The international conflict was restricted to a conflict between two ideologies, communism and capitalism. Communism did not last long, however, collapsing toward the end of twentieth century CE, in 1989, the year of the fall of the Berlin Wall. With the fall of communism as both a state and ideology, Western capitalism, now led by the United States, declared ecstatically and over-confidently the victory of liberal capitalism over Marxist socialism. It announced, 'the end of history' and imposed its ideology and way of life through neo-colonialism under the banner of 'globalization.'

In fact, history has not ended yet. There remains an intellectual conflict between Islam as individuals, parties, groups and an Ummah, on the one hand, and capitalism as a state, possessing power and authority of all types and forms, on the other hand. This conflict will intensify soon into a civilizational and international conflict, after the establishment of the Islamic Khilafah, by the permission of Allah (swt), with its closeness to establishment well-known to the West, even ahead of the Muslims.

The last three decades have witnessed the growing awareness of the Islamic ideology, civilization and culture with the Islamic Ummah. There is a deep desire of the

Ummah to resume the Islamic way of life, by establishing the Rightly Guided Khilafah (Khilafah Rashidah) on the Method of Prophethood. The West is well aware of this matter, just as it is aware of its own reality, with the beginnings of its own decline, reflected in the deep cracks in its intellectual edifice. The fall of the Western capitalist civilization is an inevitable matter, if the Muslims engage in the intellectual and political conflict competently, particularly after the return of their state. This is the natural consequence due to both the invalidity of the intellectual basis, upon which the capitalist ideology is established, and the corruption of both its concepts and treatments that emanate from its basis. Thus, Western Renaissance is neither considered to be true revival, nor is it based upon an enlightened intellectual basis and a positive spiritual basis. It is based on a collection of multiple human ideas, philosophies, tendencies and perceptions, that were formed over centuries. Give and take, conflict, war, examining and filtering; all formed a vision of a specific civilization and culture, which, according to the claim of its advocates, was meant to emancipate and grant happiness to the Western man. However, Western thought not only turned into a source of misery and binding shackles for the West, it became a source of misery for the entire world.

The conflict between Islam and the West, whether in the present or in the future, whether it is engaged in by individuals or states, whether it is manifested in the form of material actions or not, in its essence and reality, is an intellectual conflict. It is an intellectual conflict between thoughts and concepts emanating from ideologies,

civilizations and cultures that are not only disparate, but also contradictory. As the Islamic Ummah prepares to resume its leading civilizational role, it has become obligatory upon it to deeply perceive the nature of Western thought that it is struggling against. The Ummah must consciously understand its rules, foundations, values and methods. It must be armed with a deep, enlightened thought to wrestle with Western thought, in order to expose its weakness and invalidity.

In this book, *Refutation of the Capitalist Western Thought*, we review the reality of Western civilization and its culture, as well as the reality of capitalist ideology in terms of its creed and system. We clarify the origin of Western thinking and its results in terms of knowledge, methods, thoughts and concepts. We draw attention to the invalidity and corruption of this ideology in its entirety, with rational evidence. We draw the straight line next to the crooked line to clarify, for every sane person, the truth from the misguidance and the light from the darkness.

An Introduction to Western Capitalist Thought: Its Origin, Essence and Refutation

Thought is the intellect and comprehension. It is called thought though it means thinking i.e., the thinking process and passing of judgment upon things and matters. It also means the product of thinking i.e., what a man arrives at in terms of judgment, through his intellect or thinking process. What we mean by saying 'Western thought' is all of the above. It means the thinking process adopted by the West, its method of judging things and matters i.e., its methodology and its criteria. It also includes the fruits of its reasoning and the product of its thinking, with respect to knowledge, thoughts and concepts, manifested in the form of ideology, civilization and culture.

What is meant by refutation is the destructuring of its intellectual structure, invalidation of its rulings and treatments and disproving its arguments. It is the clarification of its error and invalidity, drawing attention to its falsity, within its thinking, conclusion, knowledge, method, basis, civilization and culture. Refuting Western thought is the refutation of the foundation upon which it is established. It is not necessary to refute all of its sub-thoughts, or secondary concepts, since ideologies, civilizations and cultures are based on pillars, supports and foundations that are unique to them; Treatments emanate from them, rulings are derived from them, sub-thoughts are built upon them, whilst knowledge is established upon them. Refutation is achieved by

disproving the roots and the foundations, consequently invalidating all that was built upon them. Thus, confirming the invalidity of Western concepts about life and drawing attention to the falsity of Western solutions for all the affairs of life, is by disproving the foundations upon which Western thought is built.

To initiate the refutation process, it is necessary that we clarify the essence of Western thought, its creedal view, its method in propagating the ideology, the philosophy of its treatments, foundations, basis, values and criteria. Before all of this, we will reflect upon the historical context, clarifying the emergence of Western thought and its sources. This is an introduction to help accessing the nature of the thought that this research is based on. It allows crystallized awareness of its reality, which in turn assists in perceiving its features deeply.

Emergence of Western Thought

Westerners have varying views regarding the history of their thought i.e., stages regarding the emergence of their civilization and modern culture, described as 'Enlightened' and 'Modernist.' Some Westerners have categorized history into three ages: Antiquity, the Middle Ages and the Modern Age. This comprehensive categorization is predominant. Others, like Morris Bishop in his book, *The Middle Ages*, elaborate that the Middle Ages began with the Fall of Rome, categorizing the ages into: Dark Middle Ages and High Middle Ages. Bishop considered "the 29th of May 1453," the day that Constantinople was opened, as one of the "hinge-dates" of Western history, "to mark the end of the Middle Ages and the beginning of modern times." By the end of the Middle Ages or the medieval period, the age of renaissance, reformation and reason began, as asserted by Herbert Albert Laurens Fisher in his three-volume, *A History of Europe*. Fisher emphasized that "No single date can be chosen to divide the mediaeval from the modern world".

Amongst the Westerners, there are those who elaborate more upon the stages that Western thought passed through, such as Will Durant in his book *The Story of Civilization*, and Roland N. Stromberg in his book, *An Intellectual History of Modern Europe*, in which Stromberg divided the stages into the Middle Ages, the renaissance period, the reformation period and the Baroque period. According to Stromberg, the Baroque period "has also been extended to embrace the whole mind of this age in

Europe, the one that coincided with this post-Renaissance and in a sense post-Reformation interlude— from about 1570 to perhaps 1650". Stromberg then highlights that "the seventeenth century had been an age of reason-impossible to deny when one thinks of Galileo and Newton, Descartes and Spinoza, Hobbes and Locke and Leibniz". Then came the 18th century that paved the way for the birth of ideologies in the 19th century.

The Age of Enlightenment (French: Lumières/ German: Aufklärung) is the terminology used to express the philosophy that prevailed in Europe in the eighteenth - century CE, specifically in France, England and Germany. Thus, the French historian Pierre Chaunu, stated (*As mentioned in: Dictionnaire des Idées /the Dictionary of Ideas*): "The Europe of the Enlightenment is trilingual: English always ; French at first, German in third position." *The Cambridge Dictionary of Sociology* states that *Enlightenment is based on a philosophy* "that championed reason and progress against the enchainment of thought by, especially religious, tradition and belief."

Roland N. Stromberg depicts the intense debate during the Enlightenment, by saying in his book: *An Intellectual History of Modern Europe*: "The Enlightenment spirit, born between 1690 and 1730, expressed itself above all in this inquisitive scepticism that probed old myths and took nothing on faith. So it is logical that the most exciting debate of the Enlightenment was about religion, ranging those critical spirits who called themselves "deists" against the more orthodox Christians".

Gunnar Skirbekk and Nils Gilje wrote in their book, *A History of Western Thought from Ancient Greece to the Twentieth Century*, “The period of the Enlightenment was thus marked by progressive optimism within the expanding middle class: a newly awakened confidence in reason and in man. There was a secularized Messianism, in which reason supplanted the Gospel. By the aid of reason, man would now uncover the innermost essence of reality and achieve material progress. Man would gradually become autonomous, dispensing with groundless authority and theological tutelage. Thought was liberated because man felt himself to be self-governed and independent of revelation and tradition. Atheism became fashionable.”

The concept of enlightenment in Western thought is interconnected to the concept of modernity. There are those who consider enlightenment a precursor to modernity. There are those who consider both to be synonymous, while there are those who view that the concept of enlightenment emerged from modernity. In addition there are those who say that enlightenment is a description of a thought that enlightened the darkness of the West, with the light of reason and knowledge. As for modernity, it is the description of the thought that introduced contemporariness in its knowledge and methods, in a break from antiquity.

Irrespective of the various theories, the foundation and cornerstone of modernity is religion’s abolition, sidelining or separation from life, exemplified in the coined expression of the German philosopher Martin Heidegger:

desacralisation and/or dedivinition (German: Entgöterung). In fact, it is an accurate expression that coheres with enlightenment thought, also indicating that both modernity and enlightenment are a description of the same phenomenon. The French sociologist Alain Touraine states in his book *Critique of Modernity* (French: *Critique de la modernité*) that “the idea of modernity makes science, rather than God, central to society, and at best relegates religious beliefs to the inner realm of life. This is on one side and on the other side, the mere presence of technological applications of science does not allow us to speak of a modern society. Intellectual activity must also be protected from both political propaganda and religious beliefs... the idea of modernity is therefore closely associated with that of rationalization.”

Here the question arises: Why does the history of Western thought, that is described as enlightened and modernist, revolve around the subject of rejecting, separating, sidelining and detaching religion?

The answer necessitates referring to the time period of Western history known as the Middle Ages, distinct from the era of modernity. Bertrand Russell stated in his book, *A History of Western Philosophy*, that “The period of history which is commonly called “modern” has a mental outlook which differs from that of the medieval period in many ways. Of these, two are the most important: the diminishing authority of the Church, and the increasing authority of science.” Europe during the Middle Ages was a Europe with the Church having absolute sovereignty and

sole authority, dominating life, man, society and the state. Morris Bishop states in his book, *The Middle Ages* that “The church was, in sum, more than the patron of medieval culture; it was medieval culture.” Bishop also states, “The church and its teachings pervaded man’s entire life. One could not strike bargain, cut finger, or lose farm tool without invoking celestial favor.”

In the Middle Ages, the Church was extending its sovereignty and hegemony over the society in the name of religion, according to the scholastic philosophical vision that was formed in the thirteenth century, which was based on the reconciliation between Aristotelian philosophy and Christian theology. This philosophical vision was associated with a number of erroneous concepts and teachings about man, nature, universe and life. It was adopted and claimed as absolute, whilst certainties were brought forth by the holy infallible authority. No interpretation or development or change was accepted. One had to believe, submit and be compliant to this vision.. The Church used to refuse any view or saying that contradicted its teachings. It rejected any thought that undermined its credibility. Thus, the Church used means of punishment for those who left its teachings. It adopted the method of excommunication and charged people with blasphemy in the face of heterodoxy and heresy. It suppressed any intellectual or scientific movement that challenged its interpretations and attempted to refute its concepts.

Thus, the movement of ecclesiastical persecution began against the thinkers who criticized the Church's teachings and rampant corruption. In the year 1415 CE, the Czech John Huss (Iohannes Hus), who criticized the corruption of the Church and accused it of departing from its principles, was burnt at the stake. In the year 1498 CE Girolamo Savonarola was tortured, hanged and then burnt in Italy. In the year 1611/ 1612, Bartholomew Legate and Edward Wightman were burnt in England, due to the accusation of heresy. Georges Minois stated in his book, *The Church and Science: History of Conflict* (French: *L'Église et la science. Histoire d'un malentendu*) that "Since 1544, The Paris School of Theology had been condemning the *Aristotelian Observations*, authored by Pierre de La Ramée, who criticized the philosopher Aristotle, and he was prohibited to teach. In the year 1546, The Étienne Dolet was tortured. By the end of the century, the prosecutions were multiplied. Patrizi was subjected to some harassment from the Holy Office in 1595. Campanella was arrested for the first time in 1594 after the Inquisition (the Holy Office) had stolen his papers. Giordano Bruno was executed in 1600. In the year 1601 followed by the year 1602, the University of Paris was established followed by the Parliament to reiterate the authority of peripatetic doctrine. Campanella was sentenced with life imprisonment in 1601...In 1616, Copernicus (Polish: Kopernik) school of thought was declared as a heretical school of thought. The tongue of Vanini was cut out and he was burnt alive, upon the verdict passed by the Parliament of Toulouse describing

him as an astrologer, occultist, and atheist. In 1624, three authors opposed to Aristotelianism were expelled within twenty-four hours based on the request of the Faculty of Theology in Paris. In 1629, measures were taken against some anti-Aristotelian chemists... The holy office condemned Galileo and forced him to be under house arrest.”

Nevertheless, a series of scientific discoveries were undertaken by the pioneers of scientific movements in the West, such as Copernicus (d. 1543), Johannes Kepler (d. 1630) and Galileo Galilei (d. 1642), that shook trust in the concept of the Church and undermined its credibility. These discoveries strengthened trust in Western thinkers by virtue of their scientific ability and success. The scientific research and the defiance of the Church continued. The emergence of every new discovery and every modern thought acted as a pickaxe that contributed to the destruction of the Church’s intellectual edifice. Thus, there were painful blows to the Church from Newton (d. 1757), Linnaeus (d. 1778), Lavoisier (d. 1794), Claude Bernard (d. 1878), and Darwin (d. 1882), such that the dominance of the church gradually waned. The Church was no longer required to be reformed, as apparent in the movement of Martin Luther (d. 1546) and Jean Calvin (d. 1564) that resulted in the Thirty Years’ War (1618-1648), whose results were catastrophic to the European nations. It was no longer required to merely reform the Church, instead, it was required to demolish it. The matter concluded with the defamation of priestly ecclesiastical

teachings in its entirety, refuting its concepts, teachings and intellectual perceptions, absolutely.

The famous saying of the Scottish philosopher David Hume (d. 1776) in his book, *An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding*, summarizes the view of scholars about the Church, its knowledge and methods in the eighteenth-century CE, "If we take in our hand any volume - of divinity or school metaphysics, for instance - let us ask, does it contain any abstract reasoning about quantity or number? No. Does it contain any experimental reasoning about matters of fact and existence? No. Then throw it in the fire, for it can contain nothing but sophistry and illusion."

The fall of the Church was accompanied by an end of its teachings and concepts about universe, man, life and society. This was accompanied by a growing confidence in the West about the abilities of the human mind to reveal the secrets of the universe, nature and man. Thus, reason in the West began replacing the "divine" church and its theology, gradually. Rationalism emerged to explain the cosmic phenomena, whilst societal parameters were analyzed according to rational views, free from all priestly or religious restrictions. Will Durant expressed in his book, *The Story of Civilization Volume 9* that "thought liberated from the myths of the Bible and the dogmas of the Church. Reason appeared in all the glory of a new revelation; it claimed authority henceforth in every field, and proposed to re-form education, religion, morals, literature, economy, and government in its own bright image."

Thus, the new thoughts about humankind, reasoning, knowledge, society, politics, economy, state, ruling and canons became prominent. The views of Francis Bacon (d. 1626), Rene Descartes (d. 1650), Blaise Pascal (d. 1662), Baruch Spinoza (d. 1677), Thomas Hobbes (d. 1679), John Locke (d. 1704), Montesquieu (d. 1755), Voltaire (d. 1778), and Jean-Jacques Rousseau (d. 1778), Adam Smith (d. 1790), Immanuel Kant (d. 1804), Jeremy Bentham (d. 1832), John Stuart Mill (d. 1873) and others contributed to laying the foundations of modern Western thought.

This is the summary of the development of modern Western thought, as narrated by Western historians. Regardless of the accuracy in the history of Western thought, distinguishing the facts from the exaggerated myths serving the propaganda of the so-called Western miracle, that produced the civilization of Enlightenment and modernity, it is best for us to examine the nature of Western thought, to know its reality and then expose its invalidity.

Essence of Western Thought

Samuel P. Huntington mentions in his book, *The Clash of Civilization* that the separation between spiritual and temporal authority is amongst the main features of Western civilization. This separation is considered to be the essence of Western civilization. Huntington states, "This division of authority contributed immeasurably to the development of freedom in the West." He also states, "Historically American national identity has been defined culturally by the heritage of Western civilization and politically by the principles of the American creed on which Americans overwhelmingly agree: liberty, democracy, individualism, equality before the law, constitutionalism, private property." Huntington wrote, "Europe, as Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., has said, is "the source—the unique source" of the "ideas of individual liberty, political democracy, the rule of law, human rights, and cultural freedom.... These are European ideas, not Asian, nor African, nor Middle Eastern ideas, except by adoption." Huntington then said, "They make Western civilization unique, and Western civilization is valuable not because it is universal but because it is unique." Philippe Nemo says in his book, *What is the West?* (French: *Qu'est-ce que l'Occident?*) that "As a matter of fact, Western civilization may define itself, by approximation in any case, in terms of the constitutional state, democracy, intellectual freedom, critical reason, science, and the liberal economy rooted in the principle of private property."

In his book, *Civilization: The West and the Rest*, Niall Ferguson speaks of “the achievements of Western civilization – capitalism, science, the rule of law and democracy.” The historian Sir Ramsay Muir states in his book *Nationalism and Internationalism* that “law and liberty, these two, the one the bones and sinews, the other the blood and glowing flesh and senses, are the body of Western civilization.” The organisation (EuropeanValues.Info) defined six basic European values in its publication, “*Definition of the most basic European Values and their significance for our modern society*,” which are humanistic thinking, rationality, secularity, rule of law, democracy and human rights. Milan Zafirovski asserts in his book, *The Enlightenment and Its Effects on Modern Society*, that the values that distinguish the West, forming the foundation of its civilization, are “liberty, equality, justice, democracy, inclusion, human rights, dignity, well-being and happiness, humane life, civil liberties, scientific rationalism, technological and social progress and optimism, economic prosperity, free markets, secularism, pluralism and diversity, individualism, universalism, humanism, and the like... They are, first and foremost, the creation and heritage of the Enlightenment as a specific intellectual movement and victorious cultural revolution in Western Europe...”

If we rely on these sayings that define the essence of Western thought, integrating it with what has been mentioned of its development, we can give a crystallized picture that encapsulates the structural foundation of

Western ideology, delineating the pillars of its civilization and culture.

After the conflict with the Church, Western thought arrived at a conclusion that formed its intellectual basis and its creed, which is, secularism (French: Laïcité). Secularism means the liberation from the chains of the Church, freedom from the rulings of divine religion and the dependance on the human mind, equipped with the scientific method, to establish a system for the Western man, both individually and collectively. to manage the affairs of his life. Thus, freedom - emerged from secularism -, in its intellectual, political, economic and societal dimensions, is the pivotal concept on which the West built its conception of the system organizing the affairs of the individual, society and state. So, freedom is both the origin and the destination. Accordingly, this idea became sacred to the West at the individual and state levels. Democracy adopted by the West represents the organizational structure and political institutionalization that frames the idea of freedom. Therefore, as an ideology composed of a rational creed from which a system emerges, the Western ideology is based on the creed of secularism, from which the democratic system emerges. This Western ideology is called Capitalism, after its most prominent feature, which is its economic system. Capitalism's economic system is based on the idea of freedom of ownership. It is encapsulated by the well-known French phrase, "laissez faire et laissez passer," which means "Let do and let pass." It is sometimes called

Liberal Capitalism to emphasize the idea of liberty, or the prominent philosophy that it rests on.

A civilization can be defined as a set of concepts about life adopted by a nation. In this context, the most important concepts of Western civilization, adopted by the Western man and acted upon by Western states, which are central to society and for propagating around the world are the following:

- Secularism (French: Laïcité); As discussed previously, it is the creed of the West and the foundation of its civilization.
- Democracy in its form and substance: A form of ruling (it includes, inter alia, elections, sovereignty of law and separation of powers), and value system based on the so-called fundamental freedoms.
- Rationalism: The mind judges upon everything.
- Individual and public freedom: In their intellectual, political, economic and social dimensions.
- Individualism.
- Pluralism: In its intellectual, cultural, political and social dimensions.
- Human rights: This includes the idea of equality in origin, as well as the idea of equality branching into so-called gender equality.
- Utilitarianism: A conception of life that defines the meaning of happiness, along with its relationship to

both hedonism and social welfare, upon a teleological scale.

As for the culture which is a collective set of knowledge, it is prevalent now in the West to apply the term sciences to knowledge, along with a separation between the sciences, according to fields, specializations and curricula. The Westerners have what is called natural science, sometimes called the exact sciences, which includes physics, chemistry, or biology, and the formal sciences such as mathematics and informatics. They also have, humanities and social sciences - as they are often called -, or behavioral sciences, or sciences of mind and spiritual science (German: Geisteswissenschaften). Only the humanities and social sciences are considered to be among culture as defined. It includes several sciences, like social science, psychology, economics, anthropology (the study of humanity), philosophy, linguistics, law and legal studies, political science and others.

These bodies of knowledge known as sciences, along with all the methods that derive from them in various fields, namely, the research methods including historical, descriptive, inductive and statistical methods, and critical methods including Impressionism, Formalism, Functionalism, Structuralism and Deconstruction, are all based on the West's viewpoint and are established upon the basis of its thought about life. They are also influenced by either its methodology of rationalism or its theory of empiricism. This makes the separation between the objective and the subjective from amongst the most

difficult matters. It requires conscientiousness and vigilance to distinguish between the mere objective intellectual research, from the subjective ones that is influenced by the Western intellectual basis and its method.

Whilst we are examining, researching and refuting Western culture, we should draw attention to the necessity of distinguishing between two matters: the theoretical aspect and the practical aspect. The theoretical aspect of Western thought, or the so-called theoretical reason, encompasses Western culture as a whole, with all that it produces of knowledge and research. Thus, it includes a number of trends, orientations, methods and schools of thought that are matters of interest to Western philosophy, as an example, and the so-called epistemology which is specific to the research of the theory of knowledge in the past and present, regardless of the practical aspect and its influence on society, state and individuals, in terms of formulating thoughts, systems and behavior. Therefore, in the context of our practical research, we are neither concerned, as an example, with Bergson's theory of intuition, nor with Russell's analytic philosophy nor with Schopenhauer's pessimism or other theories that are considered central to Western culture, despite the fact that they have no significant impact on the practical formulation of the Western ideology and its civilization. In the West, there are a number of trends, theories and intellectual schools of thought, however, in reality, they are nothing but fruits of Western civilization and its dominant concepts, even if they appear as refutations or criticisms. Some of

them are influential like the philosophy of feminism, whilst others are not. Thus, one should not be deceived by this; the differentiation between the two matters, theoretical and practical i.e., the differentiation between thoughts as knowledge alone on the one hand, and on the other hand, thoughts as concepts upon which the ideology is established, according to which the civilization is formulated. These are the concepts that are established as standards and values in the society, to which individuals and groups are subjected to and upon which the state is established, with its systems and solutions. Although we have not discussed in this book such trends, orientations and intellectual schools of thought, that fall under the so-called general Western culture, our refutation to Western thought as a whole does not neglect the basis upon which this thought is established, along with all that it produces.

We would like to refute Western thought, ideology, method, civilization and culture. It is the Western (Euro-American) thinking overall, whether its methodology of rationalism or its theory of empiricism and its scientific method, as well as its fruits, the so-called enlightenment or modernity. Its ideology is called Capitalism and its creed is called Secularism (French: Laïcité). Its method to propagate the ideology is called colonialism. Its system is called democracy that is based on the idea of freedom. Its philosophy is called liberalism which comprises individualism as a tendency, whilst its conception toward life is known as utilitarianism.

Refuting the Method of Western Thinking

The subject of refuting the method of Western thinking is related to how the West generates thoughts, regardless of whatever the thoughts may be. This includes the subject of how and where from the West derives its thought including the subject of the method taken to arrive at any knowledge. This also includes the source and dependency of the thought. As clarified earlier, the West presents itself as a pioneer of rational and scientific methods. Thus, its method of thinking is based on these two elements: Rationalism and Science.

Reason and Rationalism

As for Rationalism, it has several meanings in Western culture. This includes a particular philosophical meaning which is the opposite to Empiricism, and a general meaning, which is a commitment to the standards of rationality -as defined by John Cottingham in his book *Rationalism*. This general meaning is what we are concerned about in this subject. This is because the common denominator between all Western thinkers is the agreement to make the mind as the arbiter (*hakim*), regardless of its tools for analysis and judgement i.e., the mind is the reference point to judge upon all things and matters not religion. Clarence Crane Brinton in his book, *The Shaping of the Modern Mind* states "Rationalism tends then to banish God and the supernatural from the universe. It has left only the natural, which the rationalist holds to be ultimately understandable, almost always by what most of us know as the methods of scientific investigation." The organisation (EuropeanValues.Info) summarizes, in its publication, *Definition of the most basic European Values*, that the standards of modern rationality that contradict the ecclesiastical view in the following points:

- Reason stands above faith:

Before: God's omniscience stood "infinitely" far above human reason.

Afterward: Human reason more and more refutes the conveyed "omniscience" of God.

- A new way of decision making becomes possible:

Before: Faith must be chosen as the ultimate source of decisions. A decision made on the basis of reason was not welcomed.

Afterward: Reason becomes the ultimate source of decision.

- Century-old restrictions get suspended:

Before: Human reasoning and acts were restricted by religious dogmas and totalitarian rules.

Afterward: The use of reason overrules religious and absolutistic bans on free thought and acts.

- What is identified as “good”?

Before: The Bible defined what is “good.”

Afterward: “Good” is defined as “reasonable.”

- Basis of Evaluation:

Before: Evaluation occurred on the basis of the Bible and religious principles. Afterward: Evaluation occurs on the basis of a rational consideration of the situation.]

Thus, the West is rationalist in the sense that it abandons religion and depends on reason, and reason alone, as the arbiter. The dominance of reason appears in the West within what the Westerners acknowledge as principles, values and norms. These constitute the foundations of Western thought as a whole, as an ideology, civilization and culture. For them, values are abstract holistic perceptions about things and actions, in

terms of describing them as good (*khair*) or bad /evil (*sharr*), beautiful (*hasan*) or ugly (*qabeeh*), right or wrong and moral or immoral. Consequently, things and actions are described as desirable or undesirable. For the West, the established and adopted values are considered on the one side as criteria of what is good (*khair*) or beautiful (*hasan*) to the individuals and groups. On the other side, they are considered as comprehensive criteria that guide and direct individuals and societal behavior.

As for the principles, some of them differentiate the principles from the values, whilst others do not differentiate amongst them. The differentiation made by some is not in the sense of meaning, but in the sense of continuity and particularity. So, some of the values are subject to change and relativity. However, as for the principles, they are fixed values that do not change. They are considered as humanly universal, including freedom, equality and secularism. As for the norms, they are - according to the West - a set of specific rulings enacted in behaviors subaction alongside the laws. They usually emerge from values, and they are related to the morals and traditions prevalent in society, that determine whether behavior is acceptable or rejected. Western values, principles and norms emerged from the Western viewpoint about life, or the so-called Worldview based on the separation of religion from life and the arbitration by the mind alone; by making benefit as a basis to define the meaning of good and bad, as well as beautiful and ugly. Therefore, they act as a modal manifestation of Western philosophy related to things and actions in terms of act

criterion i.e., abstinence and performance, in terms of judgment that includes reward and punishment, and in terms of the intent and values to be considered during an action.

Western thinkers relied on the consequence and result of an action to determine the goodness or beauty of that action. This is called, according to them, Consequentialism. Consequentialist theory asserts that whether an action is good and/or beautiful, i.e., required or desired, depends on its beneficial/utilitarian outcome to man. In his book, *An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation*, Jeremy Bentham stated, "By utility is meant that property in any object, whereby it tends to produce benefit, advantage, pleasure, good, or happiness." Thus, Utilitarianism defines the objective of man to pursue the seeking of happiness. It is claimed that happiness is achieved by all that benefits and all that benefits is pleasure. This view is prevalent in the West, forming the practical Western perception of life. Nevertheless, the west expresses it anew, through the concept of welfare. An action is evaluated for moral acceptance or rejection, in consideration of it being beautiful or ugly, according to what is achieved for the welfare of man as an individual or a group. Values and norms are set only to achieve that notion.

Thus, regardless of the term, the result is the same, the benefit decided by the human mind is the only criterion. There is no interference of religion or God. Thus, rationalists affirm the ability of the mind to comprehend

what is good and bad on its own, without the need for religion. To prove this, they cite the so-called Euthyphro dilemma, which is found in Plato's dialogue Euthyphro, in which Socrates asks Euthyphro, "Is the pious loved by the gods because it is pious, or is it pious because it is loved by the gods?" If one asserts the first premise, the Rationalists will say that the meaning of this is that the action has in fact no value at all. Instead, it is a legal consideration subject to the will of God. Thus, if God had not commanded you to be just, you would have not been just, whilst justice is a reality for all human beings, without which life will not be organized. If one asserts the second premise, they will say that if the action and its criterion are intrinsically good, then it is independent of God. The human mind can comprehend it without the need for God. In this way, the West established its rational system of values, excluding religion by using its Rationalism.

The Euthyphro dilemma frames the West's rationalistic view, whether consequentialism or idealism, with respect to the subject of values and morals as a whole. This theory justifies the exclusion of religion from life. This dilemma is nothing but a fallacy. This is because, regardless of their misperception of God and the invalidity of their belief, it is established upon the false basis of recognition that actions are intrinsically good and bad, or beautiful and ugly, such that the mind can comprehend them, determining whether they are desirable or undesirable.

As for what pertains to good and bad, it is the characterization of actions in terms of their effect on man and in terms of whether to perform a certain action or not. Thus, man likes things that fall under the sphere which either he dominates or the sphere that dominates him. Also, he hates things within both spheres. So, he attempts to interpret this love and hatred, as good and bad. He inclines to call what he loves, as good, and what he hates, as bad. Similarly, he calls some actions to be good, whilst others to be bad on the basis of what benefits him or what harms him.

In reality, actions emanating from man, within his sphere of dominance, cannot be described as good or bad in themselves. This is because they are actions alone, that are not characterized as good or bad in themselves. Instead, the characterization of being good or bad is based on external considerations, outside of the nature of actions. So, killing a human soul cannot be called good or bad. Instead, it is only called killing. The characterization of being good or bad is external to that action. Thus, killing someone who wages war is good, whilst killing a citizen, or covenanted person or the one who is under protection (*musta'min*), is bad. The first killer would be rewarded, whilst the second killer would be punished, although both are undertaking the same action, of killing, without differentiation. What decides the good and bad are the factors that drive man to do a specific action, as well as the objective for which he enacts an action. Thus, the factors that drive man to do an action and the objective for which he carries out an action, are the two things that

determine the good and bad in an action. This is irrespective of whether man likes or hates an action and whether an action benefits him or harms him.

As for actions that occur from a person or against him in the sphere that dominates him, man describes them to be good or bad based on his love or hatred towards them and based on his benefit or harm from them. However, this characterization does not mean that they are characterized by their reality. Man may see something as good, whilst it is in fact bad. Man may see something as bad, whilst it is in fact good. Allah (swt) said,

﴿وَعَسَىٰ أَنْ تَكْرَهُوا شَيْئًا وَهُوَ خَيْرٌ لَّكُمْ وَعَسَىٰ أَنْ تُحِبُّوا شَيْئًا وَهُوَ شَرٌّ لَّكُمْ

وَاللَّهُ يَعْلَمُ وَأَنْتُمْ لَا تَعْلَمُونَ ﴿٢١٦﴾

“But perhaps you hate a thing and it is good for you; and perhaps you love a thing and it is bad for you. And Allah Knows, while you know not.” [TMQ Surah Al-Baqarah 2: 216].

This is in relation to good and bad. As for the subject of beauty and ugliness, actions are characterized by the judgment of man and by the reward and punishment of them. Actions of man are materialistic in nature despite their circumstances and considerations. The nature of being materialistic does not characterize itself as being either beautiful or ugly. Instead, actions are described by their external circumstances and considerations. These external factors explain the nature of actions as being either beautiful or ugly. This cannot be the mind because

the mind is subject to disparity, difference and contradiction. The mind's estimations of beauty and ugliness are influenced by the environment in which a person lives. Minds are subject to disparity and difference over the passage of time. If the mind is left to determine beauty and ugliness, then the thing that is ugly to one group of people will be beautiful to another group. The same thing may be beautiful at one time, whilst ugly at other times. The description of an action to be beautiful or ugly must be applicable to all human beings, at all times. Accordingly, the characterization of actions being either beautiful or ugly, by their nature, must come from a power that is beyond the mind, which is Allah (swt).

Man gives himself the authority to judge actions to be either beautiful or ugly by making analogies upon things. Since man finds that he is able to judge the bitter thing as ugly, the sweet thing as beautiful, the hideous form as ugly and the pretty form as beautiful, he thinks that he can judge truth as beautiful, falsehood as ugly, fulfilling the promise as beautiful and treachery as ugly. So, he gave himself the authority of judging actions as beautiful or ugly. Based on his judgment, he determines penalties for ugly actions and rewards for beautiful actions. He did so even though actions cannot be compared with things. This is because things can be sensed for their bitterness, sweetness, hideousness and beauty and so judgment can be passed upon them. In contrast, nothing can be found within actions that can be sensed by man, so that he can judge upon them, as to whether they are ugly or beautiful.

Thus, actions themselves cannot be judged as ugly or beautiful absolutely.

The analogies made by man for good and bad, and for beauty and ugliness, are varying and contradicting analogies. This is because they emanate from a limited mind, based upon sensations that are contradictory and not definite. It is not correct to leave the measuring of good and bad, or beauty and ugliness, to man. This is because beautiful and ugliness will be different from one time to another, from one group to another. This contradicts the reality of an ideology being universal, through its characterization of actions for the whole of humankind, for all ages. Therefore, the characterization must be from a power that is beyond the mind, to explain to man what is good and bad and what is beauty and ugliness, thereby determining for him what brings him benefit and what prevents harm. This power is the Creator of Man who is Allah (swt). Allah (swt) said,

﴿أَلَا يَعْلَمُ مَنْ خَلَقَ وَهُوَ اللَّطِيفُ الْخَبِيرُ﴾

“Does He who created not know, while He is the Subtle, the Acquainted?” [TMQ Surah Al-Mulk 67:14].

It must not be said here that differences and disparities do not necessarily have to be negative, as they may be positive in that they indicate evolution and progress. Accordingly, the evolution of Western laws is because of the evolution of societies and people. This must not be said because the treatments (Mu'alajat), in origin, are the organized rulings to satisfy a human, with

respect to his organic needs and instincts, whilst considering him as a human. The reality of the system is that it does not treat the problems of humans, by considering them on an individual basis, or considering the place and time in which they live. Instead, the system would address the problems of Man by considering him as a human, whether male or female, Arab or non-Arab, white or black, as well as without differentiating between an ancient Man, contemporary Man or future Man. The system would treat him as a human, without taking into consideration time and place. There is no difference between a current Man and ancient Man. There is no distinction between the contemporary Man and ancient Man in terms of hunger, thirst, fear and lust. This is because the organic needs and instincts are the same for every human. They do not differ from one individual to another, nor do they vary from one time to another. What is seen as a change in human living is in terms of practical realities and not in terms of the nature of humans themselves. The change occurs only in the forms of lifestyle. So, the ancient man lived in caves and rode on horses, whilst the contemporary man lives in skyscrapers and flies in airplanes. If we scrutinize closely, we will find that the motive for ancient Man to live in caves and ride on horses, is the same as the motive for contemporary man to live in buildings and fly in airplanes. Accordingly, the system that is good for all times and places, is the system that provides treatments for the problems applicable to all human beings regardless of their color, sex, race, place and time.

As for the values, Western thought erred in its research in four aspects:

Firstly, regarding the values discussed by Western thinkers such as freedom, dignity, justice, equality, mercy, integrity, tolerance, liability and others, there are abstract concepts whose meanings are not perceived unless they are connected with perceptibles, i.e., with the source of reception and applied treatments. Accordingly, we see that people do not differ over their adoption of abstract concepts, instead, they differ over their sources and their practical implementation. Accordingly, it is fraudulent to say, for instance, that equality is a universal value and human requirement, knowing what it is means for a Westerner, is other than what it means for a Muslim. It is meant in Capitalism in a manner other than what is meant in Islam.

Secondly, the values discussed by Westerners, seeking to emphasize them in their societies, are not achievable. This is because they contradict the Western viewpoint or ideology that depicts life from the utilitarian angle of seeking benefit. Thus, if the values are not concordant to the viewpoint about life, then they are mere ideas that do not transform into purpose and practice. This reality is known by a group of Western thinkers themselves. It prompted them to revive the so-called theory of Deontological Ethics (duty-based ethics). This means that they perceive the possibility of Western commitment to values, without considering their consequences and benefits. So, they perceive that

Westerners will not lie because lying is ugly (qabeeh) in itself and to be truthful because truth, by its nature, is good. This is an imaginary, idealistic view that is not achievable in any group of individuals in the West, as there is no motive for implementation. Just because a Man knows that truthfulness is good, it does not automatically follow that he will adhere to it. There must be a binding motive, accompanied by praise or condemnation. So, for a man whose creed separates this world from what is before and what is after, makes his individuality the center of the universe, depicts for him a single life which is the worldly life, he would devour the pleasures of this world as much as possible. This person will not pay any attention to truthfulness, except to the extent that it benefits him. It cannot be said here that laws with their punitive authority could be a deterrent and stimulus for abidance. This cannot be said because laws do not control human behavior at all times and places. Instead, their control over human behavior is deficient and has limited effect. An individual needs another stimulus, when neglecting the laws.

Thirdly, characterizing values is not a rational issue for Man to evaluate. Man could simply focus on some concepts and values to validate, whilst neglecting others, based on his viewpoint about life. For instance, the concept of honor has no meaning within the West, whilst it is amongst the basic concepts of Muslims. The spiritual value is not present in the Western system of values although millions of people are religious. Yet, the West ignores it because it is secular and does not care about

religious aspects. Also, it is up to a man to compare between values in order to choose the best of them, even if the values are not comparable or equivalent. However, he would not be satisfied with that. He would still compare and equate between the values. However, comparison and equivalence are not based on the virtue of values themselves, but based on how values affect man. Accordingly, humankind establishes a framework of comparison and equivalence between values, with respect to what values bring of benefit or harm to him. Accordingly, he makes himself the criterion, or makes the effect of values upon him, as the criterion. This is, in fact, the comparison between the effects of values on himself, as opposed to between the values themselves. Since the constitutions of human beings differ with respect to the effects of values, they differ in their comparison between values. Individuals who are dominated by materialistic inclinations, driven by lusts, would neglect values other than materialistic ones. They would prefer materialistic values and go out to achieve them, as is the reality perceived in the West.

Fourthly: The Western value system is invalid from its basis. This is because all Western thinkers, irrespective of their different schools of thoughts and tendencies, when looking at regulating behavior, did not differentiate between the concepts that guide behavior and the aim (*qasd*) of those concepts. Their research was all about the values related to regulating human behavior and not their aim. Thus, the values which they discuss, which number in their hundreds such as integrity, love, focus, empathy,

discipline, humility, understanding, tolerance, freedom, democracy, courage, equality, sincerity, honesty and others, fall within the framework of regulating individuals, as well as the relationships between individuals, in other words, the regulatory concepts related to groups in a society. The Western values include individual moral traits, however, they do not have any relationship to the values of actions. This is because man as a human performs actions to satiate his instincts and organic needs, according to a specific concept that determines for him the permissibility of performing an action or abstaining from it. However, he does not perform actions with the regulatory concepts in mind alone. In fact, he also considers the realization of the aim of an action that he performs. Otherwise, an action would be in vain. The aim (*qasd*) of the action i.e., for what purpose he performs an action, is called the value of action.

The Western civilization is based on the basis of separating religion from life, denying the impact of religion on life, characterizing life as benefit and making utilitarianism the criterion for actions. Consequently, it does not possess moral or spiritual or human values, except by way of formality. In fact, the Western civilization possesses only utilitarian, materialistic values alone. This utilitarian materialistic view is what brings misery to human beings. The French philosopher, Émile Bréhier, in his book, *Contemporary Themes in Philosophy* (French: *Les thèmes actuels de la philosophie*), laments as how "material science has led to an industrial civilization that indulged deeply in materialism and eradicated the

humanity of man, making him lose his intrinsic nature, turning him into an object or a machine". As for the disciplinary concepts of behavior, including moral concepts, which the West also calls values, Western thinkers began to discuss them as they saw their necessity and societal need for them. However, they are only amendments to the capitalist ideology after its failure and catastrophic impact on humanity became obvious. Nevertheless, moral values other than materialistic are not intended for their intrinsic nature. Instead, they are only intended for a beneficial purpose, to prevent misery. Will Durant wrote in his book, *The Story of Philosophy*, that, "Voltaire sees much. He argues: "if there is a hamlet, to be good it must have a religion." "I want my lawyer, my tailor, and my wife to believe in God," says "A" in "A, B, C" ; "so, I imagine, I shall be less robbed and less deceived." "If God did not exist it would be necessary to invent him." So, morality itself is necessary for the Western thought inasmuch as it achieves an interest or a benefit.

Science and Scientific Method

If man is to be the arbiter, as the West asserts, then how does he arbitrate? How does he derive his human knowledge? What is the criterion to measure truth? These methodological questions, related to the productive way of thinking, were asked by the West, after it removed religion from life, both as a source of knowledge and method. The West's answer was restricted to two doctrines: the Rationalist doctrine and the Empirical doctrine. The Rationalist doctrine asserts that thinking is precedent over reality. So, it depends on reason, as a source of knowledge and not the senses. The doctrine views that reason, whether by intuition and deduction or through innate "a priori" knowledge, is the measure of certainty and truth, not experience. As for the Empirical doctrine, it views that sensation is the only source to generate thoughts. It also asserts that all precedent human knowledge was also obtained through experience and sensation, "a posteriori" rather than "a priori." In accordance with Empiricism, a scientific experimental method was formed. That is why Empiricism is called Experimentalism because it relies on experiment as a measure of truth or knowledge. From the empirical point of view, several philosophies emerged that influenced the thoughts related to societal systems in the West. From this empirical view, the philosophies of materialism, utilitarianism, positivism, pragmatism and others emerged.

Considering the achievements and discoveries made by the scientific empirical method, that contributed to the

West's renaissance from a material perspective, it adopted this mode of inquiry as a method of thinking. It was revered to the level of sanctity, making it the only basis of thinking and the measure of truth. The West gave scientific thinking dominance in all matters, generalizing for all research to the extent that some of the knowledge related to humans, society and its relations, is carried out according to this empirical scientific method, based on the so-called Determinism. With the emergence of the theory of relativity, quantum theory, the discovery of unconventional Engineering and other matters, skepticism was raised over the certainty of science, as well as determinism. This paved the way for a counter-revolution against science, empirical method and determinism, from the middle of the twentieth century. So, some Western thinkers attempted to criticize science and to exhibit its failure, particularly with regards to its view of a human as a natural, material phenomenon. Nevertheless, science has remained dominant, retaining authority over knowledge in the West. The scientific method has remained as a measure of thinking, as a criterion for criticism and as a basis of knowledge. Thus, by referring to scientific thinking or critical thinking, the West means the empirical scientific method alone.

In fact, the Western theory of science is invalid in two aspects: it is invalid from the aspect of it being a knowledge in itself. Also, it is invalid from the aspect of its consideration as the basis of thinking.

As for the first aspect, science, according to the West's perception, is not just a method but the substance of knowledge, reflecting ultimate human comprehension.

Auguste Comte (died 1857), the founder of the doctrine of positivism, offered an account regarding the nature of scientific knowledge, proposing that human knowledge, generally, undergoes three phases: (1) the theological stage, (2) the metaphysical stage, and (3) the scientific stage.

During the theological stage, all natural phenomena were explained in terms of supernatural forces represented in deities. During the metaphysical stage, human beings started to think abstractly; they started to take logical considerations into account for explaining a natural phenomenon. During the scientific stage, humans learn about nature according to the empirical method. They explain nature through this method, formulating positive knowledge in the scientific and descriptive forms. This enables man to dominate nature, control it and subject it for his purpose, as Auguste Comte claimed. However, science has failed miserably, regardless of claims and advocacy. Science has not provided man with comprehensive and inclusive knowledge about his existence, his role and purpose. Instead, it only provided him with materialistic knowledge that generated the industrial and post-industrial civilization. It is distinguished by its in-depth qualitative and quantitative explanation of the world, contributing to human beings subjecting nature. However, science has kept man away from knowing himself, comprehending the essence of his humanity and distracting him from comprehending his being and becoming.

This is because science considers man's quest to find out about his existence and destiny as merely

philosophical research. Science relegates this quest to the realm of cosmology, ontology and metaphysics. Science maintains that tangible knowledge of material reality transcends and so this quest cannot be concluded, so there is no use in researching. Thus the nature of science is of a descriptive nature, defining the world qualitatively and quantitatively. This means that science is concerned with things and matters as they are, not as they should be, explaining phenomena in terms of quality and quantity.

Therefore, science is closer to description than explanation, as explanation entails matters beyond description. Explanation (*tafseer*) is the study of causes of existence of phenomena and their objectives. Description of human by science does not provide him with the explanation of his reality. This is because science disregards explaining the objective of human reality. Analyzing the world in both qualitative and quantitative senses help humankind to understand the world only in terms of its description. However, it does not provide humankind principles for conduct or concepts regarding purpose. Regardless of its expanse, the knowledge provided by science is only a partial knowledge, related to a part of man's existence and his world. Science does not encompass all the phenomena of his life and the aspects of his existence. Allah (swt) says,

﴿يَعْلَمُونَ ظَاهِرًا مِّنَ الْحَيَاةِ الدُّنْيَا وَهُمْ عَنِ الْآخِرَةِ هُمْ غَافِلُونَ ﴿٧﴾﴾

“They know what is apparent of the worldly life, but they, of the Hereafter, are unaware.” [TMQ Surah

Ar-Rum 30:7]. There are many questions which science is unable to answer. The most important of them are regarding why? Why do humans exist? Why does the Universe exist? Why does life exist? These are all crucial questions related to man and his life. Man can neither rest nor make decisions, unless he finds the answers for the aforesaid questions, whether the answers are valid or invalid.

In this respect, the French politician and writer André Malraux (died 1976) states: "Our civilization is the first in history to answer the question: What is the meaning of life? By saying: I don't know." In addition to this, the traits of the scientific method, as Westerners say, are progressivism and proliferation. The implication of this is that all scientific knowledge is subject to development, evolution, adjustment and change. However, this also means that science does not provide ultimate knowledge. Thus, it is not possible for a man to build his life and his systems upon this basis. It is thus wrong to say that science is a knowledge that establishes the meaning of life, explaining the reality of human existence.

As for considering the scientific method as a basis of thinking, it's a false methodology. Its falsity can be seen from many sides, some of which are:

First: the Scientific method for the sake of knowledge is a specific approach to research adopted in order to reach knowledge of the truth of a subject that is researched, and it is based on specific steps: Observation, hypothesis, experiment, data analysis and conclusion. These are the steps of the classical scientific method. There are debates amongst the Western thinkers about the precedence of observation over hypothesis and vice versa. Sometimes it is called the inductive method - to

distinguish it from the rational deductive method - which is the adopted approach in many natural sciences such as medicine, physics and chemistry, as well as in the humanities such as psychology and sociology.

The method called the scientific method is not fit to be a basis of thinking for man. This is because laying a basis of thinking for humankind necessitates that it must be accessible to all of humanity, so that they can all build a foundation for their thinking. However, the scientific method is in fact a complicated method that is subject to specific laws and conditions, which not all humans can either adhere to or fulfill. Realistically, scientific thinking can be a basis of thinking for particular people and segments, but not for the general masses. If knowledge or reality is the right of all people, thinking must be made accessible upon a general basis, for everyone to build upon. This is not the case in the scientific method. The emergence of the scientific method in the West and its societal prominence were both based on a revolutionary critical trend that rejected ecclesiastical knowledge. The rejection was because the Church and clergy prevented discussion and criticism and denied humans the personal freedom to voluntarily accept or reject. However, by making science as a basis of thinking in the West, it displaced the Church as a sublime authority that had to be heeded and obeyed. What was provided by science as an explanation for the universe and life, even though it is not accessible for all to formulate and comprehend, became obliged upon everyone to submit to. This is even though it is a mere hypothesis that has not reached the level of certain law. Even if it becomes law, it cannot be considered as ultimate knowledge, for it is always subject to correction, amendment and evolution. This was how the Western thinking turned from submission to the Church to

the blind submission and following of science. Moreover, some Western thinkers consider science as a religion, such as the Scientology cult, although it does not possess the ultimate answer related to the issue of human existence. So, science, which was intended to emancipate man in the West, itself became a means of shackling humankind.

Second: The scientific method is based on the basis of experimentation. It is only possible to research materials that can be tangibly sensed. It has no place within the realm of thoughts or research related to thinking. As for the generalization of the scientific method in the West to encompass all knowledge and fields of human research, it is by emulation and imitation of the fundamental method of thinking itself, as there are Westerners who concede that the empirical method cannot be applied to all human knowledge. In fact, human emotions and sensations cannot be studied from the empirical data perspective. This is because they are not tangible materials that can be subjected to scientific experimentation. Human relationships that shape society, with specific variations, also cannot be studied according to empirical methods, based on laboratory testing.

Thirdly: The scientific method does not produce definitive results. Instead, it is indefinite and subject to error. This is observed and agreed upon in scientific research. Therefore, scientific knowledge is described as probabilistic and developing knowledge. Scientific thinking is subjected to evolution, development and change. Thus, scientific thinking is not certain. Accordingly, the scientific method is not fit as a basis for human thinking, which man can establish his existence upon and adopt as the basis of his life. This is because it neither provides stable facts nor

does it give ultimate results about the existence of things, their characteristics and essences. It doesn't even create a thought. If the scientific method is taken as the basis of thinking, it will lead to the dilution of the concept of human existence, hence losing the meaning of life. This will result in obscurity and confusion in man in comprehending the essence of his existence, awareness of himself, and purpose in life. This would shake the core of a man, making him a mere absurd being.

In short, though the scientific method has its advantages and is needed by man, it is not fit to be a basis of thinking. This is even whilst it is appropriate for empirical sciences and some of the fields of knowledge that can be subjected to laboratory testing.

The correct method that must be taken as a basis of thinking, making it an arbitrator to judge on things and matters, is the rational method of thinking. If the rational method is utilized correctly by transmitting the sensed reality through sensations to the brain with the presence of previous information (which is neither previous nor subsequent opinion), the reality will be interpreted correctly.. Sensation is inseparable from thinking, contrary to what some Western thinkers assert. Previous information is not the previously held opinions, as asserted by some Western thinkers. Previous information is the necessary element required for thinking. The rational method, whether it is defined correctly or not, is the method upon which man acts to think as a human, judging upon things, comprehending their existence, reality and characteristics. It is the method of thinking that is accessible to all people, which humans, regardless of their educational level, automatically adopt in their understandings, comprehensions and in passing their

judgments. The rational method is suitable for all the branches of knowledge and research fields. Thus, it is suitable for natural science, physics, mathematics, philosophy, politics and so on. Moreover, it has two distinguishing features that are not found in the scientific method. The rational method is distinguished by its ability to generate new ideas, unlike the scientific method, which is characterized by the capacity of discovery and conclusion. This is because the scientific method reveals the existing and it does not bring into being the non-existent. It is built upon the existing and does not generate the non-existent. Thus, the scientific method does not generate new thought. As for the second distinguishing feature of the rational method, it is the ability of providing definitive results about the existence of things. It provides man with decisive and definitive facts to comprehend the meaning of his life, unlike the scientific method which has a probabilistic nature. The scientific method does not provide man anything but speculations that have the possibility of error.

It may be asked: how can the rational method of thinking be made the fundamental thinking, as it has been established previously that the mind ('aql) is incapable, deficient and limited and so it cannot define what is good or bad, and what is beautiful or ugly? Or how can rational thinking be the fundamental thinking for humans, when it is said after that there is a Power other than the mind that determines for man what brings him benefit and what prevents harm? The answer is: Rational thinking is itself the basis to affirm such a Power that determines for a man what is good or bad, what is beautiful or ugly. Thus, the mind confirms that there is a Creator behind the universe, man and life who created them all, and He is Allah (swt). The mind also confirms that man is a creation who is

incapable of generating a system to organize his relationship with his Creator. Accordingly, there must be a messenger who conveys the message of the Creator, placing the system to organize the relationships between the Creator and the created. The mind also confirms the inability of creation to generate a complete system without contradiction or disparity or difference, upon whose basis man would satiate his instincts and organic needs, with the finest of arrangements. Accordingly, from this perspective, there must also be a messenger who conveys the system that the Creator - who is free from deficiency and contradiction - has approved. Thus, there is no contradiction between making the rational method the fundamental thinking and Imaan (confirmed belief) in the Power who is Allah (swt), who organizes the life affairs of humans, defining for them what is good, bad, beautiful and ugly.

About the Concept of Truth

And it is also said: There is no such thing as definitive truth, whilst it is now common to say, "truth is relative, varying from one individual to another, from one group to another, from one time to another, having no objective standards." So how can it then be said that the rational method provides the human being decisive absolute truths, which science has failed to provide? Is it not Dogmatism that establishes Determinism and Absolutism in judging opinions, thoughts and convictions? In addition, some of the judgments of the rational method itself are indecisive and so is it not similar to the scientific method? So how can the rational method be a basis of thinking, upon the argument that it is decisive?

The answer to these questions is related to clarifying the reality of truth, as well as the reality of decisiveness and indecisiveness of the judgment issued by the mind.

The concept of truth is straightforward for any person, unlike the convolutions manufactured by the modern Western theories, such as utilitarianism, correlationism, dualism and relativism, whether cognitive, cultural or moral, as well as others that have nothing to do with reality. These theories are just philosophies and fanciful constructs falsified by reason and the senses. Thus, truth is not a term to be defined by any people arbitrarily. Truth is not a mere thought comprehended by the philosophers arbitrarily, nor is it a civilizational concept chosen by some nations amongst others. Instead, the truth is a specific reality for all human beings, regardless of their differences in expressing its reality. This reality is that the truth amongst all humans, whether they realize it

or not is the conformity of judgment or thought with the reality that it denotes.

For instance, if we were to draw a geometric figure with four equal and parallel lines with four right angles and show it to Zaid and Thomas to make a judgment regarding it. Affirming the truth of their judgments will be according to a single method for all humans. The method is the agreement of their judgments with the reality of the shape drawn. If one or both of them says that the shape is a square, we will say that it is true. If any one of them says it is a triangle, we will say that it is not true. This is because the geometrical shape drawn is not an area defined by three lines.

Similarly, if Ali says such a person is at home while Jimmy says he is not at home, then the truth is the agreement of their judgments with the reality. If such a person is at home, then the statement of Ali is true. If he is not at home, then the statement of Jimmy is true. This is the concept of truth. Truth is the agreement of the thought to the reality denoted by the thought. This is regardless of the thinking itself, whether the thinking is rational or scientific or logical or any other.

As for the issue of criteria to determine the decisiveness and certainty of truths, arriving at them, thinking about them and distinguishing them from indecisiveness, all of this is governed by looking at the fields of rational study. Accordingly, rational thinking is the transference of reality to the brain through sensations, linked with previous information, by which the reality is interpreted. The judgments upon things and matters are in terms of their existence, essence and characteristics.

If rational judgment is related to the existence of an object, then there is no doubt that it is definite and certain.

This is because the judgment about the existence comes through sensation of a reality. The senses are not mistaken regarding the existence of a reality. So, judgment issued by the rational method of thinking about the existence of a reality is decisive.

As for the judgment related to the essence (composition) or characterization (properties and qualities) of an object, the judgment is indecisive, that is, susceptible to error. This is because the judgment upon the essence or characterization comes through information about the object or through the analysis of the perceived reality, according to previous information. Error can seep into this. Therefore, this judgment is liable to disparity and differences because of disparity in human abilities in terms of analysis, in the amount of information accessed and how the information is analyzed. For instance, if we hear the sound of a movement, we can decisively judge the existence of a mover. However, we cannot be certain about its essence or characterization. The mover could be a man or something else. So, our judgment here falls within indecisiveness. Nevertheless, acknowledging the occurrence of indecisiveness in some judgments does not mean that there is no, decisive absolute truth. This is because when our judgment agrees with its reality, we perceive its truth. Moreover, if we judged upon the moving object, as in the aforementioned example, that it is a man or an animal from its sensed movement, and our judgment agreed with the sensed reality, then we would have perceived the truth. Therefore, the existence of the possibility of indecisiveness, in some judgments and thoughts, does not negate the existence of decisive truth, which the mind is compelled to submit to.

As for the Westerners who claim that truth is relative and thus there is no absolute truth, as well as the ones who claim that truth is dual by nature, as there is trivial truth and great truth, like the physicist Niels Bohr who said, "There are trivial truths and there are great truths. The opposite of a trivial truth is plainly false. The opposite of a great truth is also true," these claims are false, without any doubt. Truth is related to existence. It is not possible for humans to sense something, and yet think of the possibility of insensitivity or relativity. However, if a man sees something, he cannot concurrently propose the probability of not seeing that thing, as he either saw the thing or did not. It is not possible for a sane person to say, "I have seen something and it is trivial truth, whilst the great truth is 'I have seen it and also I did not see it' or 'it exists and does not exist' or 'its existence is relative to the probability of its non-existence'." This is nonsense that does not come from sane minds.

Moreover, the concept of truth that is prevalent in Western society and among Westerners from the aspect of practical reality, is based neither on academia nor philosophy. Instead, it is a pragmatic concept known as practical philosophy or instrumentalism. Pragmatism defines truth as that which is beneficial and useful or as the 'cash-value' of ideas. William James stated (as mentioned by Bertrand Russell in his book: *A History of Western Philosophy*): "An idea is 'true' so long as to believe it is profitable to our lives." The proponents of this view - and most Westerners are - do not concern themselves with examining the foundations and essence of thought, but rather with the practical results of thought, as relativism has led them to consider the veracity of an idea through the extent of its influence in terms of benefit.

This is wrong in many respects, including: firstly, utilitarianism is associated with people, whims and personal tendencies. If truth is related to what is beneficial, then lying would be considered to be a truth, as it benefits in some situations and some people. However, it is not permissible for a sane person to say this, although this matter is noticeable in the behavior of Westerners. Secondly, the quest of humankind for the concept of truth since ancient times is the quest for a criterion to resolve conflicts and solve various problems. Since benefit is varied and differs amongst humans, it is not fit to be a criterion and principle that is referred to in the resolution of conflicts. This is simply because it does not resolve conflicts. Instead, it only maintains conflict by accepting two truths. So, conflict becomes transformed from a conflict between truth and falsehood into a conflict between truth and truth. Thirdly, making utility (benefit) as the essence of truth leads to contradiction. The example is monotheism and trinity. Regarding Allah (swt), as being either one or three, if a person adopts monotheism for the sake of benefit, whilst the other takes trinity for his benefit, it would be said that both monotheism and trinity are true. This would lead to prove the matter and its opposite to a one entity. However, that is not possible to attribute to a single entity. Fourthly, a single truth arising from the concept of utilitarian truth is in essence a lack of truth in society, state and life, because of the dominance of utilitarianism within the aforesaid. This is what is observed in Western life at the level of behavior and values.

In fact, the absence of differentiation between the rulings issued by mind i.e., between existence, essence and characterization, is what created confusion amongst this group of Western thinkers. The confusion was to the extent that some of them despaired of even the possibility

of the existence of truth. So, they resorted to the imaginary interpretations of the truth. If this differentiation became clear to them, then the scope of indecisiveness will naturally be clear to them. So it could then be said that relativism lies within the judgment upon the essence and characterization, because both are predisposed to error. The predisposition to error in the judgment naturally does not imply its truthfulness. It means the judgment has a predisposition to error, in order to differentiate between it and certain definitiveness. Accordingly, the judgment upon the essence and description is considered a correct thought, until a mistake is found. Only then is it judged to be wrong. How wonderful is the Islamic thinking that decreed centuries ago that in the subject of Aqeedah (creed) is the subject of truth and falsehood, with no lapse, and there is only one correct judgement. As for the subject of Fiqh (jurisprudence) related to the Shariah rulings, there is the correct and the wrong. Its principle is, رأيي صواب يحتمل الخطأ، ورأيك خطأ يحتمل الصواب "my opinion is correct with the possibility of error, whilst your opinion is wrong with the possibility of correctness." This is because the Aqeedah, (creed) at its core, is the judgment upon existence, which is decisive, whilst the Shariah rulings are judgment upon the essence and characterization, with most of them being indecisive.

Refuting the Creed of Western Civilization

In Europe, the Catholic Church as discussed earlier had been dominating life, society, state and the people in the name of religion. It extended its dominance over kings and rulers, from the perspective of the idea of God's mandate. It would authorize ruling for them, providing them the necessary legitimacy. Thus, rulers and kings would submit to the Catholic Church. At times they would ally with the Catholic Church for the sake of their interests. The Catholic Church extended its dominance over the people by claiming that it possessed the right of forgiveness and excommunication. Whosoever violated its teachings would be subjected to brutal inquisition. Furthermore, the Church controlled the economy through owning land and possessing wealth because of tithes and others. However, from the beginning of the sixteenth century CE, its influence began to gradually wane. This was due to many factors, the most important of which was the Protestant Reformation led by Martin Luther. Reformation paved the way for what some Westerners call: "the emergence of the state and the avoidance of the divine". In his book, *The Advent of Democracy Volume 1 The Modern Revolution* (French: *L'avènement de la démocratie I La révolution moderne*), Marcel Gauchet said, "The relationship of men to God has irrevocably shifted. Luther's operation strikes at the principle of mediation at the heart, at the auspices of the Church, the pivotal institution which materialized it in the Christian world... The questioning of what the unity between the Heaven and the Earth engages over, is the first step of the modern era."

As a result of the emergence of Protestantism, England abandoned the Catholic doctrine and established the Anglican Church to emphasize royal supremacy over it, separating from Rome and the Papal authority. Then the Thirty Years War broke out, in which the Hapsburg monarchy, the Spanish Empire, France, Sweden, Denmark-Norway and Germanic entities participated. The war continued until 1648, the year in which the treaties constituting the Peace of Westphalia were signed, ending the religious war. It marked the beginning of the emergence of the modern nation state, as it included references to the secularization of church assets, meaning that they were transferred to non-religious authorities i.e., temporal state authorities. All of this coincided with economic developments experienced by Europe, after the stage of geographical discoveries. Also, it coincided with the change in the view about the Church, its teachings and knowledge, through the intellectual and scientific revolutions that have been mentioned previously.

As a result of all these factors, Europe welcomed the eighteenth-century CE within an atmosphere conducive to separating religion from life, as affirmed by the principles of the French Revolution of 1789. The idea was not consolidated and implemented until the end of the nineteenth century CE and the beginning of the twentieth century CE, when it was later known as secularism. The origin of secularism [translated into Arabic as *Al'almaniya*/العلمانية] is in the sense of Earthliness (لدنويوية/*donyawia*) and worldliness (*'alamaniya* /عالمانية), from the sense of the world (عالم/*'alam*) and not from knowledge or science (*'ilm* /علم). It is called Laïcité in the Francophone and Catholic nations. It is worthy of mentioning that not all

Western nations that adopted secularism, stipulated secularism in their constitutions. Instead, some, like England, stipulate a particular church or a particular religion as the religion of the state. However, France, as a contrasting example, enacted Article 1 of the French Constitution discouraging religious involvement in government affairs, based on the 1905 French law on the Separation of the Churches and the State (French: Loi du 9 décembre 1905 concernant la séparation des Églises et de l'État). It is considered an anomaly in the context of historical, intellectual and political considerations. That is why, some Westerners differentiate between secularism and Laïcité as the latter is the secularism stipulated by France constitutionally.

Secularism is often defined as the separation of the Church from the state. However, this meaning does not really reflect its philosophy or accurately indicate its doctrinal conception, but rather expresses its operational concept. As a matter of fact, the West reached the conviction of separating of religion from life. This is the philosophical and doctrinal conception of the idea of secularism that the West has followed since the eighteenth century. However, the West brought forward this concept in a functional manner by mentioning the two aspects that symbolize it: on the one hand, the Church, as a body expressing religion with its ancient beliefs and teachings, and, on the other hand, the state as a body expressing life with its modern, rationalist modalities.

The reality of secularism or Laïcité, in the definitions of Westerners themselves, is the separation of religion from life. For example, Maurice Barbier says in his book

La Laïcité: “In a broad sense, it refers to the separation of religion from profane realities. It implies that these profane realities escape the grip or influence of religion, whether it be a faith, a community or a religious authority. Thus, in the West, philosophy has been emancipated from theology, the various sciences have been constituted outside Christianity and sometimes against it, and all human realities - political, social, cultural, etc. - have taken on their autonomy from Christianity. - This has been achieved through a more or less long process of separation, which is called laicization or secularization. This is why we can call a society, a way of thinking, a morality, which are completely removed from any religious influence and which obey only their own principles of rational and natural order, laic/secular. In the same way, we can speak of the laicism of education, to indicate that it has no confessional character. ”

The philosopher Charles Taylor, in his book, *A Secular Age*, distinguishes between three meanings of secularism held in the West: The first and second meaning are related to the position of the state and the individual within the “public spaces. These have been allegedly emptied of God, or of any reference to ultimate reality. Or taken from another side, as we function within various spheres of activity—economic, political, cultural, educational, professional, recreational—the norms and principles we follow, the deliberations we engage in, generally don’t refer us to God or to any religious beliefs; the considerations we act on are internal to the “rationality” of each sphere—maximum gain within the economy, the greatest benefit to the greatest number in the political area, and so on. This is in striking contrast to earlier

periods, when Christian faith laid down authoritative prescriptions, often through the mouths of the clergy, which could not be easily ignored in any of these domains, such as the ban on usury, or the obligation to enforce orthodoxy.” As for the third Western meaning of secularism, it focused on the change of attitudes toward religion. In the words of Charles Taylor, "the shift to secularity in this sense consists, among other things, of a move from a society where belief in God is unchallenged

and indeed, unproblematic, to one in which it is understood to be one option among others, and frequently not the easiest to embrace".

Some Western thinkers prefer to divide secularism/ Laïcité, and not to treat it as a unique, cohesive cognitive, political and philosophical system. Thus, some thinkers divide it into French and Anglo-Saxon, some into “soft” and “hard” or Laïcité ouverte (open secularism), and Laïcité militante (militant secularism), some into atheist and neutral and some others into partial and comprehensive secularism and so on. All these divisions, particularly the partial and comprehensive division of secularism, which is currently common amongst some of the Muslims specifically, do not change the reality of secularism or Laïcité in its nature. Secularism’s nature is that of separating religion from life, which in turns results in the separation of religion from the state. Partial secularism is not just a pragmatic, operational view, instead, it is an intellectual viewpoint based on the rationalist philosophy, which does not recognize the validity of religion to rule and take care of the affairs of people. The operational aspect of secular solutions cannot

be separated from the intellectual and philosophical aspects, as some may hold. This is because the one who advocates partial secularism needs to justify the truth and validity of the approach, intellectually and philosophically. Therefore, secularism/laïcité is the separation of religion from life and it is the creed, intellectual basis and intellectual leadership of the West.

As for secularism being the creed of the West, this is because it is the fundamental thought that the West firmly believes in. Secularism is considered by the West as the solution for the greatest problem of humankind, representing a comprehensive viewpoint about universe, man and life, in all of their relationships with what is before and after this worldly life. As for secularism being the intellectual basis of the West, this is because it is the foundation upon which all the sub-thoughts are built. It is the foundation from which the system for living emerges. As for secularism being the intellectual leadership of the West, this is because it leads all those who adopt it into a specific viewpoint about life, into a specific way of living and into a shared criterion for judging thoughts, facts and events, all from a specific angle.

Secularism is false with respect to its being a creed, intellectual basis and intellectual leadership. Its falsity arises from several aspects, some of which are:

The Falsity of Secularism as a Creed

In the Western perception, the word creed (credo) is associated with a number of negative concepts. For the Westerner, creed is synonymous with religious beliefs that emerge from an unconscious source, which compels man to believe in things without evidence. To the Westerner, creed also implies an acceptance of the mind of the supernatural or metaphysical reality, without proving and demonstrating. Faith is defined by Jacqueline Russ in her *Dictionary of Philosophy* (French: Dictionnaire de philosophie) "...from the moral perspective, it is the rational but unprovable belief related to the existence of God, immortality of souls and freedom... from the religious perspective, it is the spiritual orientation towards revealed and dogmatic reality (unprovable and unreviewable)." Thus, we must evaluate the falsity of the Western intellectual view about the concept of creed and its essence, before clarifying the falsity of Western creed itself.

In its reality for all human beings, creed means to firmly believe that a proposition forms a basic idea. This belief may or may not be connected to religion i.e., the belief in the Creator and the Day of Resurrection. The Communist has a creed, i.e., he firmly believes, that there is no God, and that the universe is matter. The Muslim has a creed, i.e., he firmly believes, that there is a God, and that the universe is created by a Creator. So, a firm belief is key to believing in a creed. This is irrespective of the subject of the belief itself, as to whether it is religious or

areligious. The firmness can only be with evidence approved by the believer. Accordingly, a creed is a firm belief based on evidence, irrespective of the nature of the evidence on which the believer relies.

Herein rises an issue related to evidence as the West restricts the indication of evidence to science alone. Dominique Morin says in his book *Dieu Existe-t-il? (Does God Exist?)*, "If the matter is related to the existence of God, Christian philosophers and theologians have agreed that the word evidence, which is definitely in our world connected to the accuracy of science, is inappropriate. Thus, many, like Thomas Aquinas, prefer to speak of the ways to reach God." The former Pope Benedict XVI, Joseph Aloisius Ratzinger noted in his book, *La Foi chrétienne hier et aujourd'hui* (named in English: *Introduction to Christianity*), "No one is able to provide a mathematical proof of God and his kingdom; the believer himself is unable to do so for his own use."

The restriction of evidence to scientific proofs is wrong. In fact, evidence (*Daleel*) means: the guide to that which is sought, or what leads to the comprehension of a proposition, or it is the methodology that proves the validity of a predicate or the credence of a hypothesis, or it is the knowledge of a thing that entails a knowledge of something else. This is the meaning of evidence among all peoples. Muslims and Westerners do not differ over defining evidence. In his book (the universals,) *Kitab Al-Kulliyat* (الكليات), the Muslim scholar, Abul Baqaa' Al-Kafawi said: "Evidence is the guide to that which is sought.

Sometimes it is mentioned and meant to be the signifier... and other times it is mentioned and meant to be a sign set to perceive the signified, that is why smoke was named evidence of the fire. Then the name of the evidence is applicable on everything by which the signified is known, whether it is sensual or legislative (Shar'ee), whether it is definite or indefinite..." The Westerner, the Dutchman, H. Willemsen, said in his *Dictionary of Philosophy* (Dutch: *Woordenboek Filosofie*), "Evidence of any predicate is the methodology that affirms its validity...". The Westerner, the French woman, Jacqueline Russ in her *Dictionary of Philosophy* (French: *Dictionnaire De Philosophie*) said, "The evidence...is the process by which the validity of hypothesis is proved." Thus, evidence is what can lead to prove a certain matter. This is evidence in terms of its reality among all human beings. As for the condition of it being scientific or rational or logical or intuitive or emotional or other than this, it is the subject of its characteristics and content, not the subject of its essence. In other words, what guides to what is sought, is considered evidence. In fact, considering science or reason or emotion, as an attribute of the guide, does not exclude it from being considered as evidence. This is because, describing evidence with one of these attributes only expresses its content and identifies its parameters, and does not mean the restriction of it.

Therefore, whether the philosophers, theologians or Western thinkers refer to evidence as a way, indicator or sign, does not change the reality and essence of evidence. It is also regardless of whether the theologians

consider affect, pragmatists consider the benefit, moralists consider the moral factor or rationalists consider the intellect as the basis of faith and creed. All of their belief is based on evidence, although the type of evidence itself is different.

If this is comprehended, the error at the level of study and inquiry in the West in the context of creed can be observed. The study of creed must not be devoted to the nature of belief if it has evidence or not. This is because the reality of creed among humankind is that it can only be affirmed by evidence. The study must therefore be devoted to the validity of the evidence upon which a creed depends. Does it have to be scientific, rational, logical or something else, considering that decisive belief among the whole of humankind can only come from evidence? Is it appropriate to consider that all evidence achieves decisive belief or not? This is the context of study.

Science is not suitable as evidence for a creed because it is limited to issues that are tangible and sensed for research and experimentation. However, the existence of God is not tangible, whilst the existence of paradise, hellfire and angels is not sensed and so they cannot be subjected to experimentation. Hence the error of the Western view of creed, in terms of concept, stipulation and condition, becomes apparent. As for what is suitable as evidence for the veracity of decisiveness of a certain belief, i.e., as evidence of a creed, it is the intellect or the rational method. As we have clarified above, it is the only method that is suitable as a basis of thinking for humans,

upon which judgments are built and the comprehensive view of the existence of man and his purpose in life are established. Accordingly, our view toward the Western creed, in terms of establishing its invalidity and corruption is based on the intellect. It is based on the rational method to judge upon things and issues. The falsity of the Western creed is rationally established and reflected through a number of aspects, which include the following:

1- The Western creed is in fact a result of the societal, political and historical circumstances of the West uniquely. It emerged as a compromise solution to end the conflict between the Church, thinkers and rulers. It did not result from a thought nor was it built upon reason. It is a creed by agreement, meaning that people agree on its functionality, but it is not a creed based on reason, i.e., its people did not establish its evidence rationally for its validity. An example of this is in France. Laïcité was submitted for a majority vote in the House of Representatives (Chambre des députés). On 3rd July 1905, Laïcité received 341 votes for and 233 votes against. Then it was submitted to the Upper Legislative House (Sénat) on on 6th December 1905 and the result was 181 votes for and 102 votes against. Thus, Laïcité became a binding law upon all persons, regardless of its validity or invalidity from an intellectual perspective. So, secularism does not have an intellectual justification for it. Instead, all of its justifications are historical alone, as an expression of the experience of a certain group of people. The invalidity of these justifications are not hidden to any sane person. If someone was to say, 'The West suffered

from religion, and it declined because of it, however, when the West separated religion from life, it revived.' This can be rebutted by saying, 'Muslims revived and were elevated due to religion. When they became weak in understanding their religion, when it was removed from their life, they declined.' Therefore, the historical judgments expressing the experience of a certain group of people is not suitable to be a rational evidence to establish the validity of a creed. There must be intellectual justifications and rational evidence, and secularism lacks both.

2- Since secularism emerged as a compromise solution to the conflict between the Church on the one side and thinkers and rulers on the other, it represented a compromise solution, whereby both parties conceded part of their demands. In this context, we need to study the reality of this creed in terms of its origin. Such a study would clarify the contradictory logic of modern Western thought for us. We ask the following questions: Over what matters did the clergy concede ground? Did the clergy concede a part of a religious demand or a clerical demand?

If it is said that the clergy conceded on religious matters, this affirms that religion, in fact, had a relationship to life's affairs, hence it was not appropriate to separate both aspects. This shows the error in the West's creed and the error in separating religion from life. However, if it is said that the clergy conceded on clerical matters, not religious ones, this would mean that religion, in fact, had no relationship to life's affairs. Hence, this would also

invalidate the agreement that took place between the clergymen and thinkers, stipulating the separation of religion from life. This is because it would represent an agreement upon a non-existent dispute, meaning that there was no relationship of religion to life, to compel the condition of separation between both aspects.

Here, one might say: 'Religion means the clergy according to the Western perspective, as there existed a connection between the Church and religion. Accordingly, the West does not differentiate between both.' However, the rebuttal would be: 'this would invalidate the nature of secularism being a universal creed, appropriate for all of humankind. This is because it is based on the Western experience of religion and so it is not suitable to generalize for the whole of humanity.'

This is from one aspect. From another aspect, the compromise solution is a compromising conciliation that cannot be used to reconcile between opinions and thoughts. A compromise is deployed for the sake of conciliation among peoples with conflicting interests. However, judgment upon a thought reveals its characteristic as either being invalid and wrong, or correct and valid. A sound mind does not accept combining truth and falsehood, lightness and darkness, in a compromising conciliation.

Accordingly, secularism is in fact a compromise solution among two conflicting groups. One group rejected religion, giving themselves the authority to compromise rationalist opinions. The other group adhered to religion,

giving themselves the authority to concede religious opinions. This affirms that secularism emerged as a result of a compromising conciliation between men, as a compromise solution between two conflicting parties. Such a resolution or reconciliation did not occur between the actual rationalist thought and religion in themselves. This indicates that the conflict between religion and rationalist thought continues to exist until this day. This also indicates that Western thought did not provide a rational solution to the root of the problem. This can be observed in debates about religion and its relation to politics until this day within Western society.

It may be said here: 'The West has ended the dispute by not examining it and made the subject of the problem the interests of individuals instead.' The rebuttal to this is: 'The issue of the existence of the Creator, the Arranger and a religion that organizes the affairs of man is an issue for humanity in general and not an individualistic issue. It is related to man in his capacity as a human and not in his capacity as being an individual. The evidence for the issue being an issue for humanity is that it concerns humans as a whole. It is this issue that has been given importance by humankind since ancient times until the present day. Thus, religion is not an individualistic issue. However, it is the West that wants to make it an individualistic issue, even though it is an issue for all of humanity.'

Moreover, by making religion an individualistic issue, the West runs away from solving the problem. Thus, the

West was incapable of solving the problem radically, either by acknowledging religion and its role in life and society, or by advocating the elimination of religion completely, by denying it. Instead of these options, the West chose the conciliatory compromise of separating religion from life, leaving the issue of faith and atheism for the individual. This reveals that the West did not actually solve the problem, fleeing away from the problem instead. Fleeing away from solving the problem means the problem still persists and continues to exist. This is what prompted the famous sociologist, Peter L. Berger, who was one of the most vocal advocates of secularism in the 1960s, to express in his book, *The Desecularization of the World: Resurgent Religion and World Politics*, "The world today, with some exceptions...is as furiously religious as it ever was, and in some places more so than ever. This means that a whole body of literature by historians and social scientists loosely labeled 'secularization theory' is essentially mistaken". Accordingly, the question about the relationship between religion and life's affairs still continues to exist, which the Western thinking has yet to study and provide an answer for.

3- The creed of separating religion from life contradicts itself. This is because it both affirms and negates religion at the same time. By advocating the separation of religion from life, it affirms religion, since separation between two matters acknowledges and affirms the existence of both of them. Separation occurs between two existing things. Separation neither occurs between two non-existent things nor between an existing

thing and a non-existent thing. As for the negation of religion after its affirmation, it is understood from the reality of religion itself. Religion is a belief in the Creator and in the Day of Resurrection and Judgment. Belief in the Creator mandates acknowledgement of the attributes of perfection for the Creator such as omnipotence, providence and omniscience. However, the separation of religion from life negates this belief. It negates the attributes of the Creator and negates His omnipotence to organize all the affairs. Since religion mandates the belief in the Day of Judgment, the separation negates it, just as it negates the deeds for the day of judgment. Should the Creator account upon what He commands and prohibits or is He to account upon what is commanded and prohibited, by the reasoning of Western man?

Furthermore, the affirmation of the Creator mandates a view about his relationship with the creature. The relation of the Creator with the creature is to be either defined by the Creator, or by the creature. As for the creature, it is not suitable for him to define his relationship with the Creator due to his inability, deficiency and limitation. This is in addition to his lack of knowledge about the Will of the Creator (*Iradathul Khaliq*) pertaining to creature, unless the Creator Himself informs the creature. Accordingly, defining the relationship of the Creator with the creature is exclusive to the Creator alone. Here the question arises: who else is to define the relationship of the Creator with creature, if, according to the Western conception, there is to be a separation of religion, or the system of the Creator from life's affairs? If it is said that

the relationship is defined by the creature, then it is invalid, as we have clarified above. If it is said that such a relationship of separation is to be defined by the Creator himself, then where is the evidence for this? If there is any semblance of evidence of the Western conception, then it is the expression of the Bible, "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's." However, this evidence is invalid because it is not rational evidence for all of humanity. This is because the evidence may give legitimacy to separating the religion from life for Christians at best, according to their distorted understanding of Christianity. However, this does not justify the separation of religion for others like Muslims, as Islam renders Caesar and all his possessions to Allah (swt). Thus, it is invalid for secularism to be the creed of humanity as a whole.

4- The creed of secularism is a creed that also contradicts the innateness (*fitrah*) of humans. By implicitly acknowledging religion, it acknowledges the instinct of religiousness, which is innate in humans. By acknowledging religion, secularism acknowledges the necessity of satiating the instinct of religiousness. Despite this, secularism then restricts this satiation to sanctification and worship alone. However, religiousness does not appear in sanctification alone. It will also appear and manifest in all other matters in which one is incapable and needy. Since secularism separates religion and life, it negates the reality of human incapability and need, i.e., it rejects and denies a part of human innateness.

Secularism has reduced religion to a personal relationship between the Creator and the creature. Secularism recognizes on the one hand that religion is for individual sanctification and worship, but on the other hand, it ignores the human feelings of inability and shortcomings that appears in managing his affairs. Man in managing his own affairs of life, i.e., in organizing his behavior related to satiating his instincts and organic needs, shows disparity and contradiction. This indicates that man is unable and needs the Creator, the Arranger of all the affairs. Accordingly, it is a part of the human innateness that religion, i.e., the system ordered by the Creator, the Arranger and the All-Aware, should be the basis for the management of human affairs.

In conclusion, the creed of secularism is an invalid creed because it contradicts reason and human innateness. We are not wrong to say that humans have never known a creed, which is false, fragile in its foundations, superficial in its justifications and intellectually incoherent, like secularism.

The Falsity of Secularism as an Intellectual Basis

Secularism or the separation of religion from life is the Western intellectual basis upon which its thoughts are built and from which its rulings are derived. What is intended by the building of thoughts is the measure of each thought upon its fundament. If a thought agrees with the fundament, then it is accepted. If it disagrees with the fundament, then it is rejected. Amongst these thoughts is the position on the existence of a Creator, the one who manages all the affairs. This thought i.e., the existence of a Creator, an Arranger of all the affairs, contradicts with the fundament of secularism that negates the management of affairs by the Creator. This is because there is no meaning in considering Him the Arranger except by binding religion to life. As for the derivation of rulings, it means providing solutions related to taking care of life's affairs from a source acknowledged by the fundamental idea i.e., the creed. The source acknowledged by the Western creed is man or reason, since secularism negates the relationship of religion with life. Secularism thereby acknowledges fundamental premise of man making legislation alone.

Secularism is invalid as an intellectual basis because of the following reasons:

1- As a matter of fact, secularism has not determined the reality of existence, whether it is eternal or created by a Creator. Secularism did not study matter to arrive at a decisive, permanent answer. Secularism was instead content with the separation of religion from life alone. However, the idea of separation of religion from life is a thought that is internally contradictory, having a number of contradictions within itself. Secularism acknowledges

religion on the one hand, but on the other hand, it negates the existence of religion. Similarly, secularism affirms the Creator, whilst denying the connection with Him. Secularism affirms the Day of Resurrection, whilst denying its purpose. Secularism affirms the accountability in front of the Creator, whilst denying the deeds necessary for it. Secularism recognizes that man is a creation who is limited and unable, yet it makes him a deity as legislator and ruler. Secularism acknowledges the non-eternity of this worldly life, whilst at the same time it implants in humans the love of immortality and adherence to the earth.

Accordingly, contradiction is amongst the features of this intellectual basis. The thoughts that are built upon this are contradictory as they combine opposites, mixing truth with falsehood. It is not a surprise that the Western thought acknowledges Darwin's theory, although it implicitly acknowledges the idea of creation and the presence of a Creator. It is also not a surprise that it acknowledges the holiness of the Church, whilst fighting against it. There is even no surprise for us to find some Western Constitutions stipulating the separation between Church and State, which is an irrevocable constitutional article, whilst at the same time stipulating the ruling of the people by themselves. Here the contradiction is apparent if we assume that Westerners as a whole believe in religion, as a system of life's affairs. In such a case, the separation of religion from life contradicts the will of people. However, if we assume that the Westerners as a whole are atheists, denying the very existence of religion, then in such a case there is no purpose for this constitutional article, given the presence of atheists alone.

2 - Secularism is built on the basis of a compromise and conciliatory solution. So being moderate is the prominent feature of the Western intellectual basis. Moderation (golden mean or middle way) between truth and falsehood and between two falsehoods is amongst the prominent featured thoughts and treatments of the West. There are no distinctive boundaries amongst the Western thinking between good and bad, truth and falsehood, lightness and darkness and guidance and misguidance. Each solution and treatment, including intellectual, political, economic and social thoughts, are built on the basis of a moderate solution. Thus, according to a Westerner, moderation is the sublime quality that distinguishes him as, a thinker, politician, layman or clergyman, and the highest quality by which treatments and solutions are described.

Thus, the Western mind, for example, does not view the ideas of social justice, workers' rights and syndicates, as counter-capitalist ideas, but rather patch work solutions within the framework of the original idea, formulating socialist democracy, and considering it the finest system. Western legislation and laws proceed according to the measure of moderation. Suggestions are postulated and debates occur in order to create a moderate formulation, agreed upon by politicians and parliamentarians, with a conciliatory, consensus upon compromise. For them, the issue is not about right or wrong or truth or falsehood. Instead, the issue is about creating a compromise between different parties. They boast of moderation, considering the moderate solution in politics to be the ideal solution. They closely and consequentially connected moderation to democracy, as an indispensable part of it. The truth is that moderation with this meaning is the malicious idea to dilute matters, mix truth with falsehood

and the correct with the wrong. This would lead to a loss for humans and society, whereby hypocrisy and lies would prevail, whilst people would turn away from seeking truth and guidance.

3- Since secularism separates religion from life, it says that the treatments to take care of the affairs of people in life emerges from man himself. Thus, the human mind is that which defines the good and the evil and the beautiful and ugly and sovereignty belongs to man. So, man proceeds in his life according to the system which he desires and chooses. This is a false philosophy as we have clarified before, because man is incapable of creating an accurate system, without having disparities and differences.

When looking at the reality of the West, one can see the extent of the contradictions and disparities in the legislations drafted by the Western reason. Western societies have become the domain of experiments conducted by lawyers, judges, lawmakers and politicians. There exist no rights without restrictions, no laws without being changed or amended and no article without being appended by dozens of interpretations and explanations. It is to the point that constitutions and canons have become a toy in the hands of politicians, who change and amend articles continuously. Thus, the hands of the absurd have been extended to the foundations and values of the capitalist ideology. For example, the West has disfigured the notion of freedom and human rights through the introduction of anti-terrorism laws. This indicates the falsity of this intellectual basis and its inability to find treatments to reality, except by changing and amending its foundational concepts, upon which treatments to human problems emerged.

The falsity of Secularism as an Intellectual Leadership

Secularism is an intellectual leadership because it leads and directs the life of the one who adopts it. It specifies the viewpoint toward life and defines the way of life for him. As for the viewpoint of secularism, it is built upon the basis of utilitarianism (seeking benefit) as it perceives life as utility, seeing only worldly happiness and not happiness in the Hereafter. It sees only achieving the appetite of pleasure and hedonistic enjoyment through bodily pleasure. It sees no value in anything other than the materialistic value. It does not have spiritual, moral or humanitarian values. As for the way of life to which secularism leads and directs those who adopt it, it is the lifestyle represented in freedom and individualism.

Secularism as an intellectual leadership has failed because it did not grant humankind true happiness. Those who adopt it have not found tranquility and serenity. This intellectual leadership has inflicted calamities upon nations and peoples with its utilitarian viewpoint and permissive way of life. During its time, humanity has witnessed world wars, Nazi and fascist concentration camps, organized crime, poverty of millions of peoples and starvation to death. This intellectual leadership has brought with it psychological diseases, such as depression, and physical diseases, such as AIDS. Pornography has become rampant as well, which has contributed to the breakup of societal and family ties, producing a rape and violent culture against women. It also has fostered the idea of suicide. Thus, the Western intellectual leadership is a

failed one, both theoretically and practically, as attested to by its own people. Sociologists Rodney Stark and Roger Finke said as mentioned in *Sacred and Secular: Religion and Politics Worldwide* by Pippa Norris and Ronald Inglehart: “After nearly three centuries of utterly failed prophecies and misrepresentations of both present and past, it seems time to carry the secularization doctrine to the graveyard of failed theories, and there to whisper ‘requiescat in pace.’”

Refuting the Western Method in Propagating its Ideology

An ideology is incomplete without having a method to spread it to the entire world. This method defines the foreign policy of a state that implements the ideology. Within the characterization of being states, the Western nations adopt the capitalist ideology and they depend on the method of this ideology to propagate it. Accordingly, the reality of this method must be reflected upon and its invalidity must be clarified and refuted.

The Method of Capitalists in Propagating their ideology

States in the capitalist West are based on the notion of a nation state. The land and its government belong to this nation state and are defined upon its basis. It is a people defined by shared borders. A people can be defined in Western thought based on one or more factors, such as geography, history, race and linguistic heritage. These are the factors that make a distinctive, collective identity for a people, according to their view. So a people act as one body and they have a right to self-determination. They can choose to live in a sovereign state, independent of other people.

In all cases, the West views a people as having fixed territorial boundaries. The meaning of this is that the borders of a nation state are supposed to remain fixed forever, within a maximum availability for its own people. There is no legitimate basis for a nation state to expand beyond its determined borders. Westerners say that fixed borders are the best way to avoid war. However, contrary to their claim, this is in addition to making the material benefit, as a criterion that guides individuals and society, led to exacerbating the need for imperial colonialist (/imperialistic) expansion. The emerging nations in Europe found themselves incapable of regional land expansion, so they turned to colonialist expansion. This was how colonialist expansion emerged as a method of the capitalist ideology to spread itself. Colonialist imperialism persisted during the rise of the West, whether openly or covertly. It is present even today strongly. Indeed, perhaps colonialism has now reached more extreme and more pervasive forms, than any previous era of Western history.

Thus, the West has exercised colonialist expansion. It has colonized and enslaved almost all the nations of the world, within the last two centuries. Western colonialist greed is not merely reprehensible; it is consistent with their perception of material benefit. If an individual is to roam the world for his material needs and desires, then this is translated, at the state level, into material and national interests.

The Western nations utilized military force initially to enter every non-European continent and control it. The West had mostly taken the specific approach of colonializing land formally, whilst eradicating existing ruling systems. The Westerners then formed or reformed the political elites to build pro-Western ruling classes, that were committed to implementing Western systems in their lands.

The imperial tendency remained strongly present, even after the official end of colonialism, through formal independence of colonized nations. What really happened was simply a transition of explicit, official colonialism into a disguised form of enslavement, with Western powers unleashing greater levels of enslavement on peoples. On a massive scale, the West has been able to exploit the global resources and wealth, through a complex, colonialist economic order. This capitalist order forces the colonies, i.e., weaker nations, to export the greater portion of their material and human resources at unjustly low costs. The colonized nations then imported Western services and ready-made goods at expensive prices, to the point of extortion.

As for the soft campaigns implemented by the West internationally to spread the ideals of freedom and democracy, they are in fact secondary to its colonialist method. In fact, these campaigns are only a part of this method and tools to facilitate it, whilst masking its reality.

Historical Background of Western Colonialism

The origins of Western colonialist imperialism can be traced back to the bitter rivalry between the kings of Europe, during the Christian era. This conflict was despite their formal loyalty to the single Pope, who was a common denominator amongst them. European powers then explored sea routes, traversing beyond the Eastern Mediterranean to reach the Indian Subcontinent, specifically. This also led the Europeans to explore the Americas, whereby their lust for personal enrichment led to atrocities perpetrated upon the powerless people of those lands.

Atrocities were also perpetrated in certain regions of Asia and Africa. Furthermore, Europe attained a golden opportunity when the Ottoman State fell from being the leading state of the world, in the twelfth Hijri century. Thereupon, the abundant wealth of Asia and Africa was suddenly open for European colonialism.

European nations by this stage had become global powers and the fierce rivalry between them naturally turned into an international conflict. Thereby, they entered into military conflicts over what they came to newly possess. After the devastating Napoleonic Wars, the major European powers convened to put in place a mechanism to regulate imperialist rivalry amongst themselves. It was to avoid direct, open war. Although the Concert of Europe brought about a hundred years of peace within Europe, it constituted the reason for the

greatest colonialist invasions in human history. This is because it enabled the European powers to focus their attention to acquire almost the entire world.

The final chapter in the story of Western imperialism began with the Second World War, at the time when the emergence of the United States as a new superpower, led to the forced dismantlement of European empires. Subsequently, the properties of these empires became a hotbed of American exploitation. The Bretton Woods Institutions, like the International Monetary Fund [IMF], and the like, were the primary elements of this project. This was accompanied by the cultural predominance of the US around the world. The US is still expanding its military presence in nations one after another, by using the same expedients used by its European predecessors. The United States builds military bases throughout the world. It uproots local regimes, whilst reshaping the ruling classes of those lands, to ensure their loyalty to American dictates. Today's international system still serves as a tool to regulate the rivalry of major powers, whilst simultaneously providing the necessary tools to subjugate the world to their demands. The major powers of the previous Concert of Europe were replaced by the five permanent members of the Security Council of the United Nations. That means, powerful competitors that jointly oversee their collective exploitation of the entire human race.

Intellectual Background of Western Colonialism

The West was able to justify its imperialism by relying on what it asserted as International Law. This law intrinsically enabled the West to treat non-European nations, with complete distinction from European nations. Its origin goes back to the rivalries between the kings of Christian Europe in building their empires. Nevertheless, the Western International Law was effectively established after the treaties constituting the Peace of Westphalia. Thereupon, Europe abandoned the idea of numerous kings under a single pope, for the idea of independent sovereign states. Each of them was free to decide their religious and secular affairs. Thus, International Law is the Western law built on Western thinking, upon the interests of Western nations.

The Concert of Europe was not restricted to utilizing International Law to organize European domestic affairs alone. Instead, it went far beyond that, utilizing International Law to subjugate non-European powers, within the Western European order. According to the Western assertion, International Law is to be abided by all. The idea of material benefit has played a central role for the Western nations to colonialize other peoples and fight for wealth around the world. They do so without finding any real resistance from their own people who claim to believe in freedom, justice, equality and human rights!

Refuting the Colonialist Method of the West

1- Within this book, we have referred repeatedly to the concept of material benefit, whilst clarifying its danger to humanity. The falsity of this concept is manifest in its consequences, such as imperialism. Imperialism is the horrendous and barbaric act of complete subjugation and exploitation of peoples. It dehumanizes people, enslaving them to others. Centuries of Western imperialism have brought unspeakable miseries to billions of humans. It reduced previous civilizations into contiguous swathes of failed states, gripped by tyrannical rule. Imperialism intruded upon every continent, bringing with it wars, poverty, diseases and hunger. Thus, Western imperialism is a scourge, curse and punishment for all of humankind. It is the pinnacle of evil in Western civilization and this alone is enough to explain its falsity.

2- The nation state concept is a false concept from its roots. It is built on the erroneous understanding of nationhood. In reality, a nation acts as a nation in life only when it has shared concepts, convictions and criteria toward life affairs. As for history, geography, race and linguistic heritage as factors, they only contribute to the formation of shared traits amongst people. However, they cannot unify the people upon a single viewpoint toward life. Thus, the only correct method to define the nation is based on its shared ideology. Moreover, the formation of European nations themselves was generally preceded by little in the way of any of the concepts related to nationhood. In fact, historically, the so-called nation state in Europe was created randomly, based on prevailing divisions of power, whilst the Westphalian treaties were

being made. As for the territorial amendments since then, they took place for pragmatic reasons, not because of the necessary considerations for establishing nations.

3- It is wrong to assume that preventing territorial expansion puts an end to wars. European nations did not generally expand since the Peace of Westphalia. However, since then, they routinely fought the fiercest of wars against each other, as well as against the rest of the world. Also, the United States did not expand since it became fifty states. However, it has repeatedly indulged in wars around the world. The correct solution to increase or decrease the power of a state, is to allow the modification of territorial borders. This is so that the strong states, which are capable of taking care of the affairs of people, can expand their dimension to include other regions. Thus, the strong state would treat those new regions equally with respect to all its other regions, taking care of their affairs competently, unlike weak states that are incapable of effectively looking after the affairs of their people. Therefore, the correct solution to expansion is to invite other peoples to join the state on the basis of equality. Such an approach would be more effective for the United States, which actually consists of 50 states, than conspiring against the states of Central and South America, with imperialist plans, to subjugate them and control them, as is evidently the case today. It would have been more beneficial to invite some of those states to participate in its union, on the basis of equality with the pre-existing states of the federation.

4- The idea of International Law is an erroneous idea, as laws are mandatory decrees issued by a central

authority that is able to implement within its authority. Certainly, there is no higher authority capable of implementing international decrees. Accordingly, the idea of International Law has no meaning. The West brought about this term only to disguise its criminal and colonialist acts, under the veil of justifications of legal pretense. The fact is that states, since ancient times, were bound by their mutually agreed relationships and not by any over-riding international law. There were only common international customs and traditions, which were often impossible for any particular state to manipulate. Any state that violated these customs and traditions would be subject to isolation, condemnation, sanction and boycott by the entire international community. These international customs and traditions are what constitute a deterrent for any state, including the powerful states of the world.

5- Global institutions such as the United Nations, the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank, amongst others, are only tools of Western imperialism, and fall under the domination of the major powers. If international organizations are to be formed, they must be truly open to all states. They must not be restricted to any ideology or viewpoint about life. The aim of these organizations must be to become forums and platforms to facilitate honest and sincere communication. This is so that there will be dialogue and negotiation between various states, within which there will be no coercion or enforcement. It is through this alone that peace and stability in world affairs can be restored.

Refuting the Western Capitalist System

The Western system is a set of thoughts and rulings, emanating from the secular creed, that organizes the affairs of people and regulates relationships. The system includes treatments for all the problems of humankind, in all aspects of life, and it clarifies how to implement those treatments, protect the creed and propagate the ideology. The term system is also used to denote organized thoughts and rulings, within a particular subject. It is said, for instance, what is intended by the ruling system is to denote the set of thoughts and rulings, without which the affairs of the people cannot be taken care of, or without which people cannot be ruled. So, the ruling system includes political, administrative, judicial and financial, amongst other aspects.

The system emerges from the creed, because the creed is an intellectual basis upon which all the branches of thought are built and from which all rulings emerge. The creed is the root and the system is the branch. Consequently, the invalidity of the creed invalidates the entire system, as it is the branch of the creed. Nevertheless, for the sake of elaboration, we will explain here the invalidity of the Western system as a whole, by going through some fundamental foundations upon which its economic, political and social systems are established. Moreover, the West itself presents its civilization via its system to humankind as the ultimate model of progress and advancement. It claims that its system - in itself and its pillars - has sound evidence of its validity and

suitability, given to the renaissance it had achieved for its people and the material progress it had produced. The clearest example of this is the Islamic Lands where the Western capitalist and democratic systems were implemented and adopted as a method, by which Muslims are being secularized without realizing. Accordingly, the foundations of the Western system must be put on the verge of criticism to clarify its unsuitability and invalidity, as well as the falsity of what it has achieved and produced.

Refuting the Capitalist Economic System

The Capitalist economic system is a system based on freedom of ownership of the means of production. Thereby in Capitalism, each individual or group seeks to achieve self-interest, satisfaction or profit. Capitalism is centered on the following main pillars:

- 1) Private property or individual freedom to own.
- 2) Self-interest or profit which is considered as the primary motive for economic activity
- 3) Competition, through firms' freedom to enter and exit markets.
- 4) Market mechanism based on supply and demand, with price being a tool of equilibrium.
- 5) A state's limited role in economic markets.

Economists today call the economic system that is prevalent around the world, followed by most of the Western nations, by the term 'mixed economy.' It means that it is an economy that combines the free market and state intervention. Thus, it gives the private sector (individuals and companies) free rein in the economy with respect to the usage of capital, investment and production. In the mixed economy this is accompanied by the intervention of the state in certain areas and situations, to provide social services or to prevent monopolies, in order to maintain an economic balance. For instance, pricing in capitalism is regarded as the invisible hand that moves the market. However, the state may intervene in some of the goods, like tobacco, by imposing taxes, to discourage its consumption. What distinguishes the economies of states that follow the 'mixed economy' is the extent of state intervention within economic affairs.

Thus, the US economic model, for instance, differs to some extent from that of the German, French, Japanese and Swedish models. This is despite all of them inherently following the same system, regardless of their capitalism being designated as state capitalism, welfare capitalism, market capitalism, managed capitalism, modern capitalism, or something else. So, the variation does not negate their inherent capitalist nature. Mainland Europe in general tends to exert oversight and control over financial markets, whilst the United States and the United Kingdom limit such state intervention. This, however, does not mean that mainland Europe is not capitalist.

Thus, the Western economy as a whole is a capitalist economy. There is no way to speak about the difference in its types, although it is acceptable to speak about the difference in the model, within the single framework of capitalism. Moreover, state intervention which is a criteria of describing the economic system as a mixed economy, is the direct result of Capitalism itself. This is because the partial reformations witnessed by the capitalist economic theories, particularly in the first half of the twentieth century CE, through Keynesian theory, were to preserve the continuity of the capitalist system. State intervention in some countries to streamline economic behavior, accelerate growth and enact some laws related to social security, unemployment and healthcare, were due to the emergence of strong labor movements influenced by socialist thought, who demanded rights. This was also the consequence of multiple economic crises including the 1929 crisis. Capitalism was put to test and doubts were cast over its validity. There were monetary reviews, reformations and partial adjustments to save Capitalism itself, to ensure its continuity. Despite that, state intervention has itself become the subject of criticism, after

the crystallization of a new vision, called neo-liberalism at the end of twentieth century CE. Neo-liberalism had reviewed and criticized Keynes revisions, calling for curbing of state intervention and liberation of the capitalist economy from all constraints, in accordance with the original capitalist principles.

In any case, we chose to build our critical view on the philosophy of capitalist economy i.e., the foundations and principles upon which it is built. We view the economic system of Western states at large as a capitalist economy, regardless of the differences between them. This is because the foundations and rules of the economy, such as the view of the economy itself in terms of its essence and purpose, the view of the economic problem, and the definition of value, goods and services, are the same throughout the West. There is no difference within them nor have they changed.

As for the falsity within this capitalist economic system, one must consider the following points:

1- The economic material

Economists in the West see that human needs are fulfilled by two things: goods and services. Goods are the means of satiation, being sensed things that are tangible such as bread, vehicles, telephone and others. Services are also within the means of satiation, but are sensed things that are intangible, such as legal advice, car repair, cleaning and others. What makes the goods and services a means of satiation is their utility (benefit), whether this utility is achieved partially or completely, directly or indirectly. In the Western view, if this benefit is available in anything, this makes the thing suitable for satiation. Since

in capitalist economic terms, need means desire, anything that is beneficial economically falls within all that is desired, whether the thing is essential or not, regardless of some people considering it as beneficial, whilst others consider it as harmful. It is economically beneficial as long as it is desired by anyone. "Alcohol and opium are commodities just like food and clothing according to the economic concept..." as the Dutch central banker, Jelle Zijlstra, said in his book, *Introduction to Economics*.

Thus, Western capitalist economist looks into the means of satiation, goods and services, with the dominant consideration that they satiate the needs, without looking into any other considerations. Thus, wine is seen as having an economic value as it satiates the needs of individuals. A prostitute is seen as performing a service of economic value that satiates the needs of individuals. Zijlstra added, "Thus, the economy does not judge the needs or define them from a moral perspective for instance, such that they can be accepted or rejected because it is the work of ethical science. Also it does not judge the things in terms of their harm to the health because it is the work of medicine. Instead, the economy asks only whether there is a need that is to be satiated or there is a possibility of satiating the things." This means that capitalist economists are not concerned about how society should be like. Instead, they are only concerned with economic material in terms of it being a need and beneficial, economically, in origin and then how to ensure its provision. They measure everything according to its economic benefit.

This view of capitalist economists on needs and benefits just as it is and not as such how society should be, indicates that a capitalist 'homo economicus' looks at a human being as a purely materialistic person devoid of spiritual inclinations, moral thoughts and intangible goals. They do not care about the moral preeminence and the spiritual highness that should be prevalent amongst the society. They are not concerned with any of this. Instead, they are purely concerned with the materials that purely satiate material cravings alone. So, a man will not cheat whilst he profits in his trade. However, if he gets profit only by cheating, then cheating will be legal. He will not feed the poor in response to the command of God to give charity. Instead, he will feed the poor only to stop them stealing from him. The one who views man from a utilitarian perspective, who establishes economic life on the basis of this view, is in fact one of the most dangerous persons for societies and peoples. That is because he will alter human society into a jungle, where the strong devour the weak.

This is on the one hand. On the other hand, wealth and efforts, which they call goods and services, are sought by individuals, to benefit from them; their exchange by people creates relationships between them, according to which society is formed. Thus, one must look into what society is, with its relationships, in general and in detail, when looking at wealth and needs. Accordingly, paying attention to the material aspect of an economy in terms of satiating needs and satisfying desires, without attention to what is necessary for a society to be, it is the separation of economic material from relationships. It is the subjugation of man to economic material, instead of subjugating the

economic material to him, by organizing his relationships with it. This is unnatural and invalid. Accordingly, it is unacceptable to consider materials as beneficial, just because there is someone who desires them, whether they are in fact harmful or not, whether they negatively affect the relationships of people or not or whether or not they are permissible [permitted] or prohibited according to the belief of people in society. Instead, things should be considered beneficial only when they are in fact beneficial to man, keeping in view how society should be.

2- Freedom of Ownership (Private Property)

The distinct foundational basis of capitalism is the adoption of the idea of freedom of private ownership. This adoption is itself the result of the adoption of the idea of individual freedom. Since the capitalist ideology is based on the idea of freedom, with its individualism, the most important aspect of freedom of the individual is the freedom to possess whatever he wants, however he desires. Freedom of ownership is amongst the sanctities of Capitalism. According to its view, it is therefore mandatory to open the doors to possessing and developing wealth for individuals, by limiting state intervention and formulating laws to protect freedom of private ownership. The legislation of Western laws is in origin to recognize individual private ownership of all the means of production, making the state responsible for protecting this particular freedom. The state is not to legislate any laws that would nullify this freedom, whilst restricting freedom only to the extent necessary to protect the freedom of others.

This is the original capitalist philosophy toward private property. However, the reality is that private property has developed over time from individual property alone, to the property of both individuals and groups, as limited property, in their words. This transformation occurred as a result of capitalists scrambling for profit, production and development of capital wealth. Capitalism is no longer defining the freedom of individuals in ownership alone. Instead, Capitalism now ensures freedom of both individuals and a group or collective to possess. This is because industrial and technological developments imposed a new model of a competitive economy. It led to the multiplication in the volume of capital wealth and investment. This in turn imposed the necessity of owning megaprojects, of huge capital investment by groups, as companies, such as joint stock companies, rather than a single individual. Capitalism also imposed state intervention, extending its role to fund and invest in many capitalist countries, to serve the goals of the so-called welfare state. This development indicates the fictional vision and invalidity of the capitalist economy. This is due to its contradiction to the origins upon which it was built, whose characteristic was the distinct characteristic of capitalism.

The idea of freedom of private ownership of all things is invalid in itself for two reasons:

Firstly, freedom of private ownership will inevitably lead to the concentration of the means of production, in the hands of a few individuals and groups. Freedom of

private ownership ensures the concentration of wealth in the hands of a small capitalist class. It is this capitalist class which dominates the nation's economy, by becoming the authority working to subjugate the political authority to its will, making the state a mere tool to serve its interests. This is the reality of what is actually witnessed in capitalist nations.

Secondly, determining the type of ownership is related to the economic resources themselves and the economic system's view toward the distribution of wealth. This is because wealth includes what is, and what is not, to be privatized. Since capitalism basically focuses on the increase and development of wealth and does not give attention to the distribution of wealth, it asserts that all economic resources are to be privatized. This is wrong, because economic equity in any society can only be achieved through the parceling of wealth and preventing its concentration in the hands of a few. Moreover, taking care of the rights of groups mandates a certain type of ownership of public utilities, such as minerals and energy. Accordingly, the fact is that properties must not be limited to private property alone. Instead, they must be actually differentiated into private property, public property and state property. Each of these three divisions are distinct in Islam, unlike Capitalism and Socialism, which testifies to the greatness of the Islamic economic system. It is the only system that is capable of organizing the affairs of humans to ensure their basic needs, achieving their true well-being.

3- The Concept of Production

Capitalists define production as the process that leads to the creation of goods or services that have a value, contributing to the benefit of individuals. According to them, production is the creation of benefit (utility) or increasing it. However, the capitalist economy does not consider all the benefits. Instead, the matter is restricted only to saleable, materialistic economic benefits.

So, the work of a woman who performs household chores, taking care of the affairs of the home and the children, is considered productive only if she sells it as service to others. As for her action in her home for the sake of her family and children, it is considered from a microeconomic point of view, specifically from the angle of so-called 'opportunity cost,' as a loss to the labor market. Thus, economists do not take into consideration the social utility (benefit) and the role of raising (children) performed by a woman, by being a mother and a housewife. Instead, they evaluate on the basis of materialistic utility.

The view of materialistic utility that dominates Western society causes man to be evaluated on the scale of economic utility alone. Man's value is evaluated only in the economic sense within society. His goals are determined on the basis of production and consumption to execute an automated function. He revolves around production and consumption like the hinge of a cupboard, which produced what Western philosophers call 'Human Alienation.' Thus, there is no surprise for us to see a woman, for instance, feeling ashamed of undertaking a natural, instinctive, social role, as a mother and a housewife, because this is not productive economically. Therefore, she entered into the labor market with all her energy, neglecting her home and family, which in turn resulted in the fragmentation of the family and losses to children.

4- The Economic Problem

The economic problem according to the West can be simply summarized as the axiomatic principle of relative scarcity, with limited resources amidst unlimited needs. It means an insufficiency of goods and services to satiate all human needs completely. This is why they say, "The problem is that, although your wants, or desires, are virtually unlimited, the resources available to satisfy these wants are scarce," as stated in *Economics: A Contemporary Introduction* by William A. McEachern. Thus, the Western intellect sees that "human needs are unlimited and man always seeks for more and better...one can never be fully satiated," as stated in the book *Introduction to Economics* by Zijlstra. Since needs and desires are unlimited, whilst the material to satiate them are limited, the economic problem, according to Westerners, emerges from the inability of achieving the complete satiation of human needs.

This view of the West is erroneous and contradictory to the sensed reality. This is because needs that must be satiated mandatorily are only the basic needs of a person, by virtue of being a human. These are not the secondary needs or luxury needs, although Man seeks and works for the satiation of the latter. Accordingly, the basic needs such as food, clothing and shelter are limited. The wealth and efforts, which they call goods and services, are sufficiently available to satiate the primary, basic needs all over the world. As for the problem of ever-increasing needs, it is not related to the increase in basic needs, because the basic needs of a man, by virtue of being a human, do not increase. What increases continuously are the luxuries that arise from material progress. Man strives to satiate the needs for such luxuries, however, the non-

satiation of such needs does not create problems. Instead, what causes problems is the non-satiation of basic needs alone.

Accordingly, there is no problem in the limitation of goods and services to satiate basic needs, so as to define it as an economic problem for society to address. The economic problem is in fact the distribution of wealth and efforts. It is the distribution of wealth and efforts to all individuals that allows them to satiate all the basic needs completely, whilst helping them strive for the satiation of their luxury needs.

In the United States, for instance, thousands of tons of grains are dumped into the sea, without being distributed to the millions of poor in the country. The United States hoards billions of dollars, which is neither utilized in the wheels of the economy nor given to the poor. Thus, the issue is neither the scarcity of material nor the unlimitedness of needs. It is only the view of the capitalist economy which is built on monopoly, greed, envy and selfishness. It is the capitalist economy that put eighty percent of the nation's wealth into the hands of select segments of capitalists. It is the capitalists who transform societies into consumer ones, in order to market their products, to maximize profits under the pretext that the increased consumption by individuals or groups results in a higher level of well-being.

The capitalist economy has neglected the issue of the distribution of wealth. Instead, the capitalist economy made its economic goals centered on achieving materialistic development, whilst treating unemployment, inflation and deflation. Thus, the capitalist economy aims at achieving one goal, which is to increase the collective wealth of a nation. It works to reach the highest possible

production level, in the pursuit of the maximum well-being for the members of society, as a result of increasing income and raising the production level of the nation. This goal is achieved by enabling them to obtain wealth, whilst allowing individuals the freedom to work to secure production and distribution.

Thus, the capitalist economy does not find treatments to satiate the needs of individuals nor does it provide for the satiation of every individual in society. Instead, it only focuses on providing things that satiate the needs of individuals. So, it focusses on the collective needs of increasing production and income, providing the opportunity to work, whilst leaving this freedom to the individuals. This is regardless of whether satiation of basic needs is achieved for all individuals, or it is only achieved by some of the individuals, and not others. This is neither the field of economic research, nor is its goal to satiate all the basic needs of individuals. In their view, the poor must bear the responsibility for their poverty, because they themselves are the cause for it. This view of capitalists is erroneous and contradicts reality because the basic needs that must be satiated are individual needs, by virtue of being human. These are the needs of Ali and Anthony and not the needs of select groups of people or nations.

Accordingly, the origin of economic policy must be to ensure the satiation of all the basic needs of all individuals, with complete satiation, whilst enabling them to satiate the luxurious needs as much as they can. It is erroneous to increase the production, economic development and raise the living standards of a nation as a whole, without ensuring that everyone benefits. It is also erroneous to offer welfare to people, leaving them free to take welfare as much as they can, without guaranteeing

the right to live for every one of them, no matter who he is. Thus, Western economic policy that aims at economic growth and an increase in production, neglects distribution, and is concerned with the search of the production of economic material without caring for the right of every individual of society to satisfy his basic needs, is wrong. It is an erroneous policy that theoretically provides relative well-being to a group of individuals, whilst it condemns the rest to poverty and destitution, even though they are equal in their rights to live and satiate their basic needs.

As for Islam, in addition to Shariah rulings that permit ownership, work and increasing production, it has also legislated other rulings to ensure the complete satiation of all the basic needs of all individuals. Islam ensured the distribution of wealth for each individual citizen, one by one. Islam ensures all the basic needs such as food, clothing and shelter, are distributed to provide complete, satiation. Additionally, Islam enables each individual citizen to satiate luxury needs as much as possible. Thus, Islam neither ensures the satiation of basic needs as a patchwork to the system, nor addresses specific vulnerabilities, singling out certain groups to the exclusion of others, as Capitalism does. Instead, Islam made means of distribution as rulings of the system itself. Thus, the rulings permitting ownership and working for it, rulings of spending, rulings of taking care of all the affairs, all these are Shariah rulings, of equal importance in terms of legislation and evidence. Islam gives rise to a complete economic system as we have detailed in our books.

Refuting the Democratic Ruling/Governing System

When examining the concept of authority and its transfer from the Church to the people, the Western philosophers adopted an imaginary, hypothetical idea that has no basis in reality. The idea is merely a mental envisagement of Westerners, in which it is claimed that Man used to live in a natural state, then moved to a civil state through a social contract. Within the social contract, individuals agreed to give up part of their will, to form a collective will, which is a public will constituting sovereignty. The agreement of individuals to give up their (part of) will is called a social contract, which is the fundamental of the state, authority and public freedom. They viewed that the system that embodies this idea, as they envisaged, is the democratic system, as a political entity to exercise the sovereignty of the populous. Accordingly, the ruling /governing system of the West is based on Democracy. The word Democracy is a Greek-origin compound word, δημοκρατία, demokratia, which is from demos (people) and kratos (rule), so it means “rule of the people.” Democracy is usually defined by the famous saying of Abraham Lincoln (d 1865), who said, “government of the people, by the people, for the people” during his Gettysburg Address.

In its global, contemporary concept as promoted by the West, Democracy is inseparable from the idea of freedom (liberty). This matter is not new and has not ideated from the modern Western geniusity, as it is held. Instead, it is merely inherited from the Greeks. Aristotle says in his book *Politics*, “The basis of a democratic state is liberty; which, according to the common opinion of men,

can only be enjoyed in such a state;- this they affirm to be the great end of every democracy.” However, the modern concept of freedom (liberty) differs from that of the Greeks. This is something that distinguishes the West, starting from the era of Enlightenment and the emergence of the Western liberal philosophy.

Accordingly, Democracy is expressed in modern terms as liberal democracy, distinct from other democracies, whether ancient, or modern, such as social democracy. True democracy according to the Western perception is connected to the concept of freedom, acknowledged by the West in its era of Enlightenment. Therefore, it is described as a set of thoughts and principles related to freedom, as they perceive. Some thinkers consider it as an institutionalization of freedom. It can be said that there is a consensus amongst Westerners who support Democracy, that it is inseparable from a group of matters that are considered as the pillars of Democracy, which are: Sovereignty of the people, separation of powers, freedoms, human rights, equality, pluralism, free and fair elections followed by a peaceful transition of power, rule of law and majority rule whilst preserving the rights of minorities.

This is Democracy, concisely. It is worth mentioning that it was and is still the subject of criticism amongst Western thinkers themselves. This is what Jacques Rancière alludes to this in his book, *Hatred of Democracy*, “Hatred of democracy is certainly nothing new. Indeed it is as old as democracy itself.” The basis of criticism toward the democratic theory levelled, by most of the West's critics, arises over the term ‘people.’ It is criticized as a

vague term, differing in the definition of its meaning. Beyond this, disagreements move on to focus on the functional aspect to determine the concept of rule of the people. The functional aspect practically affirms the unrealistic idea of the rule of the people. Upon looking at the linguistic meaning of Democracy with regards to the rule of the people, we find this meaning to be devoid of reality, since the days of the Greeks themselves. The Greeks were the first to indulge in this idea, wherein the word 'people' was restricted to the free people amongst the Greeks, whilst excluding women, slaves and those who were non-Athenians. When the idea of Democracy was reinstated in the eighteenth-century CE, some thinkers realized the unrealistic nature of the theory, from a functional standpoint. This is because the consensus of all the people over ruling and administration of the state is impossible. So, they developed its functional aspect, creating the so-called representative democracy, which is democracy of elected deputies.

The one who follows the Western intellectual movement can observe the existence of a crystallized trend for decades amongst a group of thinkers, about adopting a realistic criteria for ruling. It is a trend that rejects theoretical concept of Democracy, after its unrealistic nature became clear. This trend is led by a group of thinkers, amongst them are, Vilfredo Pareto, Gaetano Mosca, Robert Michels, C. Wright Mills and others. They adopted the elite theory which is based on the idea of acquisition of power by a minority of the people in society. In his book, *The Ruling Class* (Italian: *Elementi di scienza politica*), Gaetano Mosca summarizes this reality by saying: "Among the constant facts and

tendencies that are to be found in all political organisms, one is so obvious that it is apparent to the most casual eye. In all societies from societies that are very meagerly developed and have barely attained the dawns of civilization, down to the most advanced and powerful societies two classes of people appear a class that rules and a class that is ruled. The first class, always the less numerous, performs all political functions, monopolizes power and enjoys the advantages that power brings, whereas the second, the more numerous class, is directed and controlled by the first...". In this context, the French political and legal scholar Maurice Duverger proposes in his essay "Political Parties" (French: Les Partis Politiques) to replace the formula: "government of the people by the people" by another formula that reflects the reality of governance, which is: "government of the people by an elite sprung from the people."

The most important criticisms levelled at Democracy by Western thinkers themselves are:

1. Oppression by the majority, with the loss of minority rights.
2. The danger of expanding the power of public opinion, since elections and decisions are subject to public opinion that is controlled by certain powers, from amongst the stakeholders and lobbyists.
3. The "iron law of oligarchy" that stipulates the monopoly of power and political organization, in the hands of a few groupings of capitalists.
4. Over time, democracy turns into bureaucracy. As time goes by, democracy becomes more and more

complex so that the power transpires in the hands of career professionals alone.

These are some of the criticisms directed toward democracy from Western thinkers themselves. However, most of them do not present an alternative. Instead, they deemed democracy as a fixed principle for which one cannot even conceive of an alternative. The British politician Anthony Birch recognized this in his book, *The Concepts and Theories of Modern Democracy*. So, on the one hand Birch maintained that modern societies are governed by elites, on the other hand he still insists “I believe that representative democracy is the best institutional arrangement for government yet devised.” Thus, despite strong criticism we find many of the thinkers who attempt to develop the mechanisms of democracy and revive its concepts and values, agreeing that democracy is the best. This is because, the democratic process – as Robert Alan Dahl mentioned in his book, *Democracy and Its Critics* – “is superior in at least three ways to other feasible ways by which people might be governed. First, it promotes freedom as no feasible alternative can: freedom in the form of individual and collective self- determination, in the degree of moral autonomy it encourages and allows, and in a broad range of other and more particular freedoms that are inherent in the democratic process, or are necessary prerequisites for its existence, or exist because people who support the idea and practice of the democratic process are, as a plain historical fact, also inclined to give generous support to other freedoms as well. Second, the democratic process promotes human development, not least in the capacity for exercising self-determination, moral autonomy, and

responsibility for one's choices. Finally, it is the surest way (if by no means a perfect one) by which human beings can protect and advance the interests and goods they share with others”.

It is clear from the above that Western thinkers themselves examined the idea of Democracy and criticized it, pointing out its flaws according to their perceptions. Despite this, their unanimous consensus is that Democracy is the best thing created by the human mind in ruling and that there is no alternative for it.

In fact, a deep look into the reality of democracy as perceived by the West shows us that the word democracy for them symbolizes two dimensions: an intellectual, civilizational dimension and a political dimension.

As for the first dimension, it is the value system that frames the West's values and its concepts about life such as freedom, equality, pluralism and secularism, amongst others. Thus, democracy in its first dimension is the political framework comprising a set of civilizational concepts adopted by the West. This meaning has been confirmed by Francis Fukuyama for example, - in his book *The End of History* – by considering democracy, the last stage in humanity's ideological development. In a similar manner, in his book, *The Western Political Systems* (French: *Les régimes politiques occidentaux*) Jean-Louis Quermonne asserted that democracy in itself is first of all a value, an ideal, and even the dominant ideology of Western societies. And Georges Burdeau also described democracy – in his book (*La démocratie*) - by saying: “Democracy is today a philosophy, a way of life, a religion and almost eventually a form of government”. Thus,

Democracy must be studied from this angle, as a set of concepts and values or the primary ideal about life. This falls within the study of the civilizational foundations adopted by the West and upon which Democracy's political entity is established.

As for the second dimension, it is related to evaluating democracy as the most superior or optimal or the best possible system of governance, as the Westerners claim. Those who agree with this angle do not look into the civilizational composition of democracy i.e., its concepts, values or ideology, which according to their point of view are subject to transformation, variation, or rejection. They only look into democracy itself or into the abstract meaning of the idea, regardless of anything else. In other words, they look at democracy as a political system that organizes the matter of ruling in any state, regulating the political issues of any society. This subject is, in reality, related to what they called 'the philosophy of governance, ' which is considered as the origin of political matters. This subject, in fact, reveals the shortcomings of the Western mind at the political and intellectual levels and its errors, right from the moment of its establishment.

Thus, a man by virtue of being a human or an individual, in terms of living in this world, is a politician who both engages in politics and is affected by it, because he takes care of his own affairs, or the affairs of those who are under his responsibility, or the affairs of his nation. Taking care of the affairs of a nation or a people or a group in which this political man belongs to obliges him to consider the issue of ruling.

The process of taking care of the affairs comes through a political entity or a state alone. This is so regardless of looking into its definition and the reason for its establishment. The state is founded upon a system that defines its form, apparatus, structures and institutions, as well as the thoughts, concepts and criteria to take care of the affairs, alongside constitutional laws that are to be implemented and other matters that fall within ruling/governing. This is called the political system or ruling/governing system.

Man's conception of a ruling system, which practically enables him to take care of the affairs, is actually framed within three questions: With what is one to be ruled? Who is the ruler? How does the ruler rule?

As for what to be ruled with, the natural case is that there is ruling by an ideology that is accepted by a group of people. Accordingly, the role of the ruler or the government is to implement or apply the set of concepts, criteria and convictions adopted by the group. This matter is proposed to both the ruler and ruled once the state is established. This proposal is not reviewed upon every election or referendum or parliamentary session or policy reflection. It is not newly proposed except in one condition, which is when the previous system falls and there exists a will to change. So, the one condition is the case of when a state is established. Accordingly, the Western state, regardless of its name, form and model, was established upon specific thoughts and concepts that are deemed to be fixed, with no consideration for their change. This is just like the Islamic state, the Khilafah (Caliphate) State that was established upon specific thoughts and concepts, that

are not the Western thoughts and concepts. Thus, being established upon an ideology, specifying what to be ruled with, is not in itself a distinguishing characteristic of the Western ruling system, making it distinct from other ruling systems.

It cannot be said here that the Western distinctiveness lies in the nature of the Western man, who expresses his own sovereignty by his own determination of concepts and values of ruling, so he chooses what one is to be ruled with and legislates his own laws. This cannot be said because the subject here is not related to the source of ruling. Instead, the subject is related to the existence of the thoughts and concepts regarding ruling. So, just as the West has an ideology to rule with, others also have other ideologies to rule with, regardless of their sources. There is no distinction between them from this perspective. Instead, the distinction appears only when studying the source of ruling, in terms of truthiness, validity and goodness of the ideology. This issue is not relevant here in terms of study, whilst we have looked at some of it before and we discuss further in the subject of Western Civilization to come. The subject of study here is the answer to the question: what is man to be ruled with? All the political systems known by humankind answer this question without exception. This means that Western political thought, particularly its belief in the democratic system, is not distinct from this perspective.

It cannot also be said that the Western democratic ruling system is distinguishable because of pluralism, guaranteeing non-monism and non-singularity, allowing multiple cultures and ideologies to exist. This cannot be

said, because Western pluralism is pluralism within the confines of its ideology alone. So, the West neither accepts any idea from outside of its ideology to influence society, nor does the West accept concepts that are contradictory to its ideology. Accordingly, the West fought with communist parties in the past and continues to fight with what it refers to as political Islam, depicting it as terrorism, radicalism and fundamentalism. Thus, it is formal pluralism not actual pluralism in an absolute sense.

If what is intended by pluralism is the difference in views, perceptions, projects and intellectual and political understandings within the confines of the same ideology, then there is no distinctiveness in the Western thought from this perspective. Such pluralism also exists in other systems, such as the Islamic ruling system.

Then there is the matter of considering pluralism by looking at so-called minorities, their rights and their duties, within two societal domains, the private and the public, a classification mentioned in Western political and social sciences. It is claimed that modern democracy is distinguished by allowing privacy and diversity in the private domain, whilst in the public domain, they are controlled by general principles that everyone must adhere to. If this is what is intended by pluralism being a distinguishing feature, then this is also wrong for two reasons. The first reason is from a practical perspective. The Western state today is imposing its concepts and values even in the private domain. It monitors Muslims both young and old, holding them accountable for every thought, interrogating them according to its culture and civilization and forcing them to integrate into its civilization.

This is far from what is claimed to be pluralism. As for the second reason, it is from the theoretical perspective of the idea, the difference between submission within the public domain to general principles, whilst living according to differing religions and convictions in the private domain. This distinctiveness is also found in the Islamic system. So, there is nothing unique about Democracy in this regard. Moreover, the concept of Dhimma (protecting the non-Muslim citizens) mandated by Islam is, in theory and practice, is superior, fairer and better in securing rights than the Western concept of minorities.

As for the matter of who rules and how he rules, the political thinkers and sociologists in the West who addressed the issue of ruling and its system, looked into human political history and its reality, enumerating the forms of ruling and the models of leadership. So, they divided the ruling systems known by man, according to their view, into various classifications, according to the criteria taken in ruling. Most of them were inherited from the Greeks. The summary is, systems either admit the eligibility of a people to rule or not.

As for the systems that do not admit a people's eligibility to rule, they include, amongst others; meritocracy - rule of those of talent, ability, and achievement; oligarchy - ruling by the few for selfish interests; aristocracy - ruling by nobles; autocracy- rule of a single individual; and theocracy - the rule of religious elites with divine sanction. As for the system based on the right of ruling for the people or based on the principle of the sovereignty of the people, asserting the eligibility of the people to determine ruling, it is the democratic system. According to the

Westerner, democracy is the only system within the classification, that is to be considered as the best and optimal.

Then there are those Western thinkers who classify systems according to legal standards such as, governance, the method of achieving power, the ruling administration and model of power that is exercised and subject to transition. Accordingly, the systems are then classified into three main groups: totalitarian, authoritarian regime and democratic. According to Western thinkers, democracy is always and forever placed as an ideal, against awful despotic models.

After conferring the right of sovereignty to man, so permitting him to determine his system and legislate, the secular West conferred the right of authority to man, so it gave him the choice to choose the ruler through elections. Thus, the Westerners intertwined all the components of ruling, without differentiating between sovereignty, authority and power. They limited the study to revolving around a single agenda point, as they perceive it. They neglected to notice either the possibility of differentiation and separation, or the existence of systems that are different and distinct. Instead, they made democracy a criterion of goodness for all political systems. This view is subjective, as they call it, i.e., not objective, partial and superficial, lacking intellectual depth and the correct understanding of the reality of ruling.

Sovereignty, according to them, means that man possesses his will and exercises it, so he chooses who the ruler is and what he rules with. Man is to determine his laws and systems, legislate those laws and choose the

one who implements them. If it is intended by man the human in an absolute sense or his kind, then - based on their status quo - such sovereignty belongs really to Man. This is because the one who legislates and chooses the ruler in the West is human. However, if it is intended by man the single human being as an individual, which is their actual intended meaning, such that each man is a master of himself, then such sovereignty is non-existence in the West. This is because Western systems and legislations are put forward by a group or a few persons. They are not put forward by all individuals collectively. The practical reality of the democratic West is that legislation is determined by government or a body/council that is comprised of a few individuals. Then legislations is enacted as binding laws to which all individuals must submit.

Thus, the concept of sovereignty as they conceive does not match the reality of ruling amongst them, even though they insist upon this understanding. The reality of all the ruling in this world is that there is both the ruler and the ruled. Ruling is in the hand of an individual or a group of people. All the people cannot be both the ruler and the ruled simultaneously. Accordingly, there is no such thing as sovereignty of the people by the meaning of sovereignty of all individuals. Sovereignty can either belong to a specific individual or a group of individuals, who exercise their will by determining legislation and laws for the ruled, or it can belong to the Creator, the Almighty so that the laws and legislations are derived from the Divine Revelation alone. These are two possible choices, and there is absolutely no other. However, the secular West, with its historical conflict with the Christian Church,

and its experience with theocratic ruling systems that controlled people through the concept of divine right, blinded the insight of the West. So, the West refused the servitude of humans to the Creator and accepted the servitude of humans to other humans, referring to this as sovereignty.

Once man determines the system that governs his relationship, the source of the system and legislation, defining what to be ruled with, he will then naturally move to the subject of study as to who implements them. This is related to the subject of who rules. Since the people are not able to collectively perform this implementation, it is delegated to some of them on behalf of the collective, to undertake implementation, with their choice and consent. This is the meaning of power or authority belonging to a people or a nation. Again, this meaning is not unique to democracy or something that makes it distinct. Instead, such a conception of authority is also found in other systems. Indeed, it is the core of the Islamic ruling system, as the Khilafah is defined as a contract of consent and choice. This is because the Khilafah is established upon the Bay'ah (pledge) of obedience given to the one who has the right to be obeyed, from amongst those who are charged with authority. There must be consensus both over the one to whom Bay'ah to assume power is given, as well as over those who give the Bay'ah. Although the West confers authority to the people from a theoretical perspective, as people are the ones who choose their ruler through free and fair elections, as they say, the practical reality indicates that the choice of the ruler by the people in the West is a choice, nominally and not in reality. This is because in reality the owners of immense capital wealth,

the rich and the powerful, are the ones who really decide who the ruler is. They alone determine and direct complex electoral systems and procedures. They alone are capable of influencing public opinion, directing it to elect whoever they want. They alone are capable of funding the costliest electoral campaigns. It is a matter known and witnessed by everyone. So, the West did not give sovereignty to people from a practical perspective. Instead, sovereignty belongs to a few of the influential who enslave the people. Similarly, the West did not ensure authority belongs to the people. Instead, authority is in the hands of few of the influential. So, it is clear that people in the West are enslaved, as they neither are masters for themselves on an individual basis, nor do they possess actual authority. However, the influential were able to manipulate the people, deceiving them by convincing them that they are the masters and people of authority.

As for how the ruler rules, this question is related to two matters. The matter of how he arrives to authority or ruling and how he manages the affairs of ruling.

In relation to how one arrives at power, it has many styles such as voting, appointment, inheritance, usurpation of power and others. Today, people's customs have settled to consider that the elections are the best style. It is the style followed in the West. Regardless of the misimplementation witnessed by the Islamic ruling system over a period of history, the election style is amongst the styles that accords with Islam. The style had been practically implemented to choose the Khulafaa' (caliphs) according to the possible procedures of that time. Accordingly, democracy is neither unique nor distinct in

the style of election to choose the ruler. Instead, the style of elections is common with other ruling systems. The uniqueness and distinctiveness of democracy lies in its view of how to manage the affairs of ruling, through its perception about the concept of leadership.

Leadership in the Western view is classified into three models. Firstly, democratic leadership that encourages and allows the participation of a group in all the decisions. Secondly, authoritarian leadership or autocratic leadership in which decisions are made by an individual tyrant. Thirdly, anarchic /Laissez-faire leadership that allows members of the group to manage their affairs and take decisions by themselves. Based on these divisions, they say that democratic leadership, the collective leadership, is the best model of leadership. This concept is wrong for two reasons.

It is firstly wrong from the realistic, practical perspective. So-called collective leadership does not exist. The reality of ruling is that it is ultimately in the hands of a single person, which the Westerners know and witness even in the West itself, whether one presides over a republican or parliamentary system. When he assumes ruling, he imposes authority himself individually, such that all authority comes under the hands of the prime minister or president, whilst the remaining people of authority become assistants, employees or consultants.

For instance, the ruling is practically in the hands of the president in America, just as it is in the hands of prime ministers in England and Germany. Even the collective leadership brought by Lenin to the communists of the former Soviet Union was only a nominal collective

leadership, on paper and nothing more. In reality, leadership is always individualistic. This matter is natural because ruling or presidency or leadership is an expression of arrangement resulting from the concept. The origin of concepts and realization of facts are related to the brain in terms of sensation, linkage, weakness and strength, and in terms of the validity or abundance of information. This differs from one brain to another. It is impossible for two brains or more to agree to proceed in all matters, to judge upon things in order to manage them. Here the difference occurs. So, it becomes mandatory for one to compromise with the other, in such a case the leadership becomes individualistic, even amongst two. Thus, there can never be a collective leadership. Instead, it is only possible to ever have singular, individual leadership.

As for the second reason for being wrong, the West didn't draw a separation between two matters related to the organization of ruling, opinion and decision-making. On the other hand, Islam differentiated precisely between these matters, making Islam distinct and unique in this regard. Ruling passes through two phases, the phase of opinion and the phase of decision-making. In the first phase, the opinion is sought for treating the problem, so there will be multiple views which will be subject to deliberations and research. This is in addition to details about when the views are mandatorily binding and when they are informative. This falls within the realm of what is known in the Islamic ruling system as Shura (consultation). Allah (swt) says,

﴿وَأْمُرْهُمْ شُورَىٰ بَيْنَهُمْ﴾

“who conduct their affairs by mutual consultation.” [TMQ Surah Ash-Shura 42:38]. The

second phase is the decision-making phase. It is an individual matter in which decisions are made by a single authorized person, so decisions are not made collectively. Allah (swt) says,

﴿وَشَاوِرْهُمْ فِي الْأَمْرِ فَإِذَا عَزَمْتَ فَتَوَكَّلْ عَلَى اللَّهِ﴾

“And consult them on the matter. When you have decided, then rely upon Allah.” [TMQ Surah Aali Imran 3:156]. Thus, the ruling in Islam is neither autocratic nor democratic. Instead, the ruling system of Islam is a unique model, characterized by realism rather than formal nominal idealism.

In conclusion, democracy as a ruling system has no primacy in itself in terms of form, mechanisms and procedures. This is particularly so when democracy is compared with the Islamic ruling system. In fact, according to Westerners, democracy derives its sanctity and preference from its components, namely its concepts and civilizational values it represents, such as freedom. We will refute this too shortly.

Refuting the Western Social System

The view about man and woman in the West emerged from the Catholic and Protestant religious perceptions that viewed a woman to be inferior to man and as the origin of sin. However, the Christian view did also give great value to the relationship between man and woman, which was confined to marriage. Marriage was valued in order to form a family, that played an educational and moral role in society. When the Enlightenment movement dominated society with its modern Western thinking in the eighteenth-century CE, society adopted secularism. Secularism separated religion from life and all relations with society, whilst imposing new concepts such as freedom, equality and social justice. Secularism gave a new perception about man and society that was contrary to Christianity. Despite that, it did not change the view of women's inferiority that was prevalent in society, both in theological and philosophical literature. Instead, some philosophers attempted to justify the view philosophically and intellectually. Many philosophers of liberalism and Enlightenment such as Hume, Hobbes, Locke, Kant, Rousseau, and Montesquieu, remained skeptical about the mental faculty of women. They endorsed the view of Greek philosophers, who maintained that the male, by nature, is mentally superior to female. For instance, as mentioned in *The Story of Philosophy* by Will Durant, the Greek philosopher, Aristotle, said, "Woman is to man as the slave to the master, the manual to the mental worker, the barbarian to the Greek. Woman is an unfinished man, left standing on a lower step in the scale of development."

Not many Western philosophers had proposed the issue of gender equality in the second half of the nineteenth century, except for a few, such as John Stuart Mill in his book, *The Subjection of Women*. Therefore, Western European laws after the democratic revolutions and the secularization of society remained influenced by this view. Women were not given new rights, but their inferiority was confirmed. For example, the Napoleonic Code, also called the Civil Code of the French, issued in 1804, stipulated in article 217, "A wife, although noncommunicant or separate in property, cannot give, pledge, or acquire by free or chargeable title, without the concurrence of her husband in the act, or his consent in writing." Many of the philosophers asserted that women stayed away from politics, because they were not suitable for it by nature. Political rights were given to women only in the twentieth century CE.

For example, France granted women the right to vote in 1945, a full century and a half after the French Revolution. It is the French Revolution that called for liberty, equality, and democracy and was personified in the form of the woman, Marianne, as a significant icon. In summary, the modern Enlightenment movement did not change the inferiority view about women. Its rationality and purported values about liberty and equality were all basically directed to men alone, excluding women. Evidence for this is the failure of the amendment proposed by John Stuart Mill to the Second Reform Bill of 1867. The amendment was tabled in the British House of Commons to change the term 'man' to the term 'person,' in election laws. However, only 73 members voted in favor, whilst a majority of 194 members voted against.

Although the modern Western Enlightenment movement maintained the pre-existing view related to the respective statuses of men and women in society, it changed the view toward the relations between them and their outcome. This is because of its adoption of the idea of freedom and its definition of happiness as pleasure. It focused its gaze on the masculine and feminine relationship, i.e. the sexual relationship, by permitting sexual freedom and challenging the concept of honor, dignity and chastity, in contradiction to the Christian Church. The Christian Church considered seeking pleasure as a sin, and regarded sex as a physical, carnal, satanic act, which was allowed only within the framework of marriage, for the sake of childbearing alone and limited to a single permissible position, on particular days.

In contrast, the adoption of the modern Western view of sexual relationships was supported by the emergence of sociology and psychology, founded on the basis of the secular intellectual basis and materialist methodology. So, sociology diminished the importance of family, although it did not abolish it as a whole. It then expanded and exaggerated the role of society and state in upbringing, as manifested in the work of Émile Durkheim, for example. Psychology asserted the link of human behavior with sexual motives, warning of the role of repression in social productivity and mental illness, whilst promoting sexual liberation, as exemplified in the works of Sigmund Freud. Marxist socialism, that emerged in the mid of the nineteenth century CE, proceeded in this direction. Marxist socialism defended sexual liberation and the naturalness of liberated sexual relationships, making the abolition of marriage and family as one of the express objectives of

communism. It discussed the issue of women as a communal subject and maintained that marriage is a manifestation of private property. In his book, *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*, Friedrich Engels maintained that monogamous marriage is the subjugation of the one sex by the other and that it is the first form of class struggle within history. According to the Marxist view, marriage marginalizes the role of a woman in society, making her subservient to the economic supremacy of man, thereby persisting, whilst the family system is a capitalist institution.

The nineteenth century CE ended with its ideological conflicts, accompanied by resultant political and economic reforms. However, these did not change the condition of women. Then Western societies welcomed the twentieth century CE, from its beginning to its middle, with the outbreak of two world wars that plunged women into the arena of production and service. Western societies thereby created a new situation that forced them to recognize some of the political, economic and social rights of women. This new situation paved way for the intensification of what is called the feminist movement in its activities and raising of demands. Moreover, the movement changed its objectives and strategies. What is called the second wave of feminism began in the sixties of the twentieth century CE, targeting the entire social system pre-existing in the West with a new vision focused on genderism. Second-wave feminism's focus on eliminating gender discrimination was inspired by the philosophies of liberalism, Marxism, existentialism and the post-modernist deconstructionism. The movement was supported by sexual liberation movements and gay

organizations. Thus, the objective had become not just for the sake of equality between men and women, but for the sake of abolition of all discrimination between genders. After decades, the term gender was adopted by the international organizations including the United Nations, which adopted it as a concept in the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) of 1979. Then gender was stipulated as a term and concept in the documents of the International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD) in Cairo, Egypt, of 1994, followed by the World Conference on Women in Beijing in 1995. Many Western nations have gradually endorsed the view of genderism, as a whole or partially.

In summary, the West changed its view about men, women and the nature of relationships between them as a consequence of many factors pertaining to economic, cultural, political and social matters, that occurred over many decades. It can be said that the modern Western social system is the system that organizes the meeting of two heterosexuals or homosexuals, and it is concerned with the relationship created between them by their meeting and what branches out or results from it. It is an invalid system contradicting the intellect and human innateness (*fiṭrah*). Its invalidity is evident in the foundations upon which it is built:

1- The View Toward Man and Woman

The fundamental mistake of the West lies in its view regarding women, regardless of whether the view is traditional or modern. When its civilization was founded, all

of its theories and legislations were focused on men alone. When its shortcomings were apparent, calls for the liberation of women and advocates for their rights emerged. Thereby the West adopted the idea of gender equality, whilst this idea is in itself invalid. However, the statement of equality indicates a previous judgment that establishes separation and distinction between two matters. This indicates that the original judgment within the West was the distinction between men and women. Moreover, equality requires the precedent of a model, upon which the comparison is made for equalizing. Thus, equating women with men means holding men as a basis of comparison, making them as the basis upon which equality is determined.

This obviously means that the Western legislators considered men primarily when forming legislation. Then the Western legislators later amended, annexed and appended women within the original legislation. Thus, the origin of Western legislation is designated to men alone, rather than to both men and women together. This means that the original view about women did not change, even though some legislation has been amended. The problem persists in Western societies, appearing in various manifestations, such as role conflict. Western feminist movements of various waves perceived this matter. They perceived that the problem was not in the legislation, but in the original view itself, i.e., in the philosophy of legislation itself. This is because treatments, as rulings and principles that regulate and organize relationships, emerge from the original view about the relationships, their purposes and about whom they are concerned.

Accordingly, feminism no longer became restricted to the rights of legislation or equality, based on male-female duality. Instead, feminism developed into a call for reviewing the basis of the societal organization as a whole, including the social system and what branches out from it, in terms of concepts about man, woman, marriage, children, motherhood, fatherhood and family. The new idea in the West focused on transforming the concept of sex according to the measure of duality, i.e., male sex vs. female sex biologically, into the concept of genderism, which expresses the cultural and social formation of an individual, leading to the sharing and merger of roles in society.

For advocates of genderism, the difference between man and woman is not determined biologically. For them gender is based on the culture, ideologies and beliefs that shape the features of the identity. Thus, the difference is determined culturally. This is summarized by the famous quote of the French existentialist philosopher, Simone de Beauvoir, who said, "One is not born, but rather becomes, a woman." in her book, *The Second Sex* (French: *Le Deuxième Sexe*). So, according to their view, the role of a woman in society does not form as a result of her biological characteristics. Instead, it forms according to the social and cultural conditions that are prevalent in the society. Thus, every person must determine their gender identity. So, a male determines himself to be a man or woman, whilst a female determines herself to be a woman or man. According to their view, society must abolish the differences in sexes and roles, ensuring everyone determines their identity as they wish.

This opinion is also evidence for its own invalidity, refuting itself through self-contradiction. The self-contradiction is because the Western body of gender studies itself asserts that culture is what shapes the features of the identity of a human, whether male or female. This implies that men and women are merely the product of the culture that is prevalent in any given society. It is to be noted here that cultures and ideologies are innately multiple, diverse and contradict one another. Moreover, the West and the United Nations have themselves acknowledged cultural diversity and the obligation of tolerating them, acknowledging cultural diversity as a universal human right. It is thus natural for the identity of a Muslim woman for instance, to be different from that of a Western woman. In this way, the call to gender has unraveled its own thread before it was entwined, plucking out what it planted by its own hands.

There is no way to impose the view of gender according to their understanding, except by ending cultural diversity in the entire world, unifying all opinions upon their ideas, in order to create a universal, monoculture of genderism. This is what the United Nations ensured by the globalization of the Western gender concept, imposing it upon all other nations. This also contradicts the idea of cultural diversity and its distinctive determinants, as stipulated in the Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity, adopted by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) in 2001, supported in the West through its anthropological, sociological and other studies. Here, the supporters of genderism are only able to say, there is no contradiction between universal rights and cultural relativism or

particularism. However, we must ask them, who determined genderism as a universal right? How can genderism be truly universal, when peoples and cultures are against it and even Western society is divided in this regard?

Moreover, besides from self-contradiction on cultural grounds, genderism is also invalid because acknowledging the existence of the biological difference between male and female, on the one hand, whilst denying its influence or role in the systems of the society, on the other, is a contradiction. Legislation over abortion rights, for instance, that is adopted and defended by the genderism movement is not related to culture. Instead, it is related to the biological nature of a women, as it is specific to women and not to men. Beyond this, allowing a pregnant woman to get paid maternity leave is not related to culture. Instead, it is related to the biological nature of women, which is specific to women and not to men.

As for a woman to then say that she is a man in the event of abortion and pregnancy, because her self-determined gender identity is male, humanity must be held with at least such esteem that a response is not warranted. Indeed, the sensed and witnessed reality affirms the necessity of taking natural, biological factors into consideration when legislating, for instance. Biological factors are considered when enacting laws and treatments related to persons with disabilities, children and elderly. It is natural to observe the differences in the nature of man and woman. However, the important question is, when is it necessary to observe biological differences and when it is not? This is the place where ideologies and the evidence

for their validity or invalidity are discerned. Accordingly, the old and modern western views about men and women are erroneous views in their foundations. The correct view about men and women that is convincing to the mind and agreeing with human innateness (*fitrah*), that is capable of saving Western society and humanity as a whole from loss, wandering, misery and despair, is the view brought by Islam. Allah (swt) says,

﴿وَلَيْسَ الذَّكَرُ كَالْأُنثَىٰ ط﴾

“And the male is not like the female.” [TMQ Surah Aali Imran 3:36].

Allah (swt) says,

﴿وَأَنَّهُ خَلَقَ الذَّكَرَ وَالْأُنثَىٰ ﴿٥٣﴾﴾

“And that He creates the two mates, the male and female.” [TMQ Surah An-Najm 53:45].

Allah (swt) says,

﴿وَمَا خَلَقَ الذَّكَرَ وَالْأُنثَىٰ ﴿٩٢﴾﴾

“And [by] He who created the male and female” [TMQ Surah Al-Layl 92:3].

Allah (swt) says,

﴿يَتَأْتِيهَا النَّاسُ إِنَّا خَلَقْنَاهُمْ مِّنْ ذَكَرٍ وَأُنثَىٰ ﴿٤٩﴾﴾

“O people, indeed We have created you from male and female.” [TMQ Surah Al-Hujaraat 49:13].

Allah (swt) created male and female as two different sexes. This natural or biological innate difference - as it is said - between the sexes, i.e., the sex of male and female, is not disputed between any of the people, whether he is a believer or disbeliever, whether he is white or black, whether male or female. Despite Islam's acknowledgement of this natural difference, it does not take account of it in its view toward the two sexes. Instead, it takes account of their kind as a whole i.e., considering male and female as humans alone, which is in contrast to all other philosophies. So, man is a human and also a woman is a human. Neither a man or woman differ with one another in terms of their humanity. Nor is one distinguished from the other in any aspect of their humanity.

Allah (swt) has prepared both of them, in their capacity as humans, to enter the walks of life and inevitably made them live in the same society. He (swt) also made the survival of the human race dependent on their meeting together and their mutual presence in every society. It is not permitted to view one of them except as the other is viewed because, as humans, they possess all human characteristics and the essential requirements of life. Allah (swt) has created within each of them a vital energy (*Taqa Hayawiya*), and it is the same vital energy which He (swt) has created for the other. So, He (swt) made in each of them organic needs such as hunger, thirst and the need to relieve nature and He (swt) made in each of them a survival instinct (*Gharizat al-Baq'a*), a procreation instinct (*Gharizat al-Nau'*) and a sanctification

(*Gharizat al-Tadayyun*) instinct. They are the same organic needs and instincts that are present in each other. He (swt) has granted both of them the faculty of thought, and it is the same faculty of thought that is present in the other. Thus, intelligence is present in a man and it is the same intelligence that is present in a woman, since Allah created an intellect for mankind and not exclusively for a man or a woman.

This is the basis upon which one must proceed. Thus, the woman is not supposed to be a problem and her rights are not to be demanded separately. The matter is not about whether she is equal to man or not for both of them are humans and they have same characteristics and life dispositions, although they differ in their sexes. When Islam assigned Shariah responsibilities, it imposed them on both man and woman. When Islam elucidates the Shariah rulings to treat both of their actions, Islam neither looks at the issue of equality, comparison and similarity between both of them, in any case, nor does it take account of such aspects. Instead, Islam only looks at the specific problem that needs to be treated. So, Islam treats any specific problem by considering it as a human problem, without looking at whether it is a man's problem or a woman's problem.

So, the treatment is for the action of humans in the problems that arise. It is not the treatment for a man, on the one hand, and a woman, on the other. Thus, when Islam granted women rights (*Huquq*) and enjoined on them certain obligations and granted men rights and

enjoined on them certain obligations, it only assigned rights and obligations which related to their interests as defined by the Legislator. It also provided solutions for their actions, in their capacity as specific actions of a particular human.

Accordingly, Islam does not discriminate between men and women in its call to humanity to believe. Islam made responsibilities related to worship such as Salah, Fasting, Hajj and Zakah, one and the same, for both men and women. Similarly, Islam made morals and their characteristics one and the same, for both men and women. Islam also made the rulings of transactions, such as trading, loans, guardianship and others, one and the same, for both men and women. Islam obliged learning and teaching upon both men and women, without any discrimination. Allah (swt) has legislated to address men and women, by virtue of them being human. Allah (swt) says,

﴿إِنَّ الْمُسْلِمِينَ وَالْمُسْلِمَاتِ وَالْمُؤْمِنِينَ وَالْمُؤْمِنَاتِ وَالْقَانِتِينَ وَالْقَانِتَاتِ
وَالصَّادِقِينَ وَالصَّادِقَاتِ وَالصَّابِرِينَ وَالصَّابِرَاتِ وَالْخَشِيعِينَ وَالْخَشِيعَاتِ
وَالْمُتَصَدِّقِينَ وَالْمُتَصَدِّقَاتِ وَالصَّاتِمِينَ وَالصَّاتِمَاتِ وَالْحَافِظِينَ فُرُوجَهُمْ
وَالْحَافِظَاتِ وَالذَّاكِرِينَ اللَّهَ كَثِيرًا وَالذَّاكِرَاتِ أَعَدَّ اللَّهُ لَهُمْ مَغْفِرَةً وَأَجْرًا
عَظِيمًا﴾

“Indeed, the Muslim men and Muslim women, the believing men and believing women, the obedient men and obedient women, the truthful men and truthful

women, the patient men and patient women, the humble men and humble women, the charitable men and charitable women, the fasting men and fasting women, the men who guard their private parts and the women who do so, and the men who remember Allah often and the women who do so - for them Allah has prepared forgiveness and a great reward.” [TMQ Surah Al-Ahzab 33:35].

As for the rights and obligations and the Shariah commandments related to the biological nature of a woman by virtue of being a female, on the one hand, and that which is related to the nature of a man, by virtue of being a male, then these rights and obligations i.e., commandments, differ between men and women. This is because in these cases, it is not a treatment for humans as a generic absolute. Instead, it is a treatment to the types of humans within the genre of humans, whose human biological nature is distinct to that of the other type. Therefore, the treatment should be for this kind of human and not for all humans generically. Accordingly, Islam distinguishes women with rulings related to her femininity, such as rulings regarding menstruation, pregnancy and childbirth. Islam also made for her the right of custodianship of children to the exclusion of man. Islam made the work to earn money as permissible (*mubah*) for women, whilst making it obligatory for men. Fighting is not obliged upon women, whilst it is obligatory upon men.

This is the view of Islam toward the male and the female i.e. man and woman. It is the view based upon their human nature and not upon their respective sex or social gender. It is the correct view that removes the conflict present today around the world between males and females, making them like brothers and sisters, who work together for the stability and advancement of society.

2- Sexual Relations

The modern, liberal movement of Enlightenment opposes the concept of sexual repression, inherited from the Church, with the concept of unleashed, sexual expression and sexual liberation. It established a new idea related to the relationship between man and woman, which is limited to masculinity and femininity i.e., confined to sexual relations between them. So, the concepts of the Western people about honor, chastity and private intimate relations between the two sexes, were eroded. A sexual culture appeared that promoted eroticism and pornography, reducing women to commodities, whilst adultery and fornication became prevalent amongst men and women in European nations, from the nineteenth century CE, with some exceptions, like Victorian England, as is said. This sexual culture is amongst the manifestations of freedom and so it was not linked to marriage or the intention of childbirth to form a family.

For instance, France abolished the death penalty for adultery after the revolution, whilst the Napoleonic Code stipulated that any sexual conduct of any kind and with whomever is not punished on the condition of maturity and consent. In the twentieth century CE, a transformation took place in the entire West, due to a combination of factors. The launch of freedom to have sex without restriction, led to the spread of obscene practices. Groups were formed according to their sexual deviations, such as homosexuality, lesbianism, sadism and masochism. Industries were established for the sex trade and to

promote sex through media, films and magazines. Researches and studies appeared, conducted by psychologists and psychoanalysts, such as Wilhelm Reich. They amplified the power of sexual drive or sexual energy, termed libido, and called for sexual liberation. Psychologist Abraham Maslow granted sex a status within his famous hierarchy of needs, alongside physiological, organic needs such as breathing, drinking and eating. The feminist movement also supported sexual liberation, which it saw as liberating women from the shackles of marriage, motherhood, family, hegemonic masculinity and patriarchy.

All these factors accumulated over decades in Western society, culminating in what is known as the sexual revolution, extending from the sixties, until the eighties of the twentieth century CE. The revolution ended with the gradual recognition of the rights of homosexuals, such as the freedom to practice homosexuality and marry, amongst others. Here we are at the beginning of the third decade of the twenty-first century CE, where all manner of deviant and abnormal practices are permitted, to the point that they even exceed the decline of the cities of Sodom and Pompeii, in what was recorded in history.

In fact, such a Western view about sexual relationships based on releasing the instinct without restrictions, on the subject and manner of satiation, is invalid, contradicting both the intellect and the human innateness (*fiṭrah*). Its invalidity appears in itself in terms of the intellectual view of the basis upon which it was

established, as well as its practical results in terms of its detrimental impact on society and humans.

Western thought has acknowledged the existence of motives that push man to satiate his instincts. The West has examined all the motives, under the name of instincts and classified them within multiple divisions. In all this, it is worth noting that the Westerners did not distinguish between two matters, in most of their research. The first is the difference between the organic needs and instincts. The second is the difference between instincts and their manifestations.

The West considered sex as a natural necessity that must mandatorily be satiated. In other words, the West views the sexual act as an organic need. The West views that preventing sexual satiation, by suppression or repression, would lead to destructive consequences for both individuals and communities. Accordingly, they gave full rein to sexual satiation and they made the stimulation of sexuality intentional. However, the fact is that sex is not an organic need, but an instinct. Organic needs such as breathing, eating, drinking and defecating are distinct from instincts, with respect to the necessity of satiation. Prevention of the satiation of organic needs will lead to death, inevitably. So, the failure to breathe, eat or drink will lead to death. However, as for the instincts, they do not necessarily have to be satiated. Prevention of the satiation of instincts does not lead to death and will not cause death, although it will lead to anxiety, agitation, misery and discomfort. No-one has ever died through not having sex

and the evidence for that is the reality of humankind in general.

Organic needs are also distinguished from instincts, with respect to arousal by stimulus. Organic needs are stimulated by internal requirements, whilst the instinct is aroused by an external stimulus. Organic needs require satiation for internal requirements, as the body must survive. In contrast, instincts do not require satiation from within in origin, naturally, other than what is influenced from externally. So, the instincts are not aroused from internal requirements. Instead, instincts are aroused by external stimulus, in terms of a stimulating tangible reality or a stimulating thought depicting a tangible reality, including all that falls within the meaning of stimulus. If such an external stimulus was not to be found, then there is no arousal of the instinct. Furthermore, the demand for satiation in both quality and quantity is linked to the arousal. The less the external stimulus, the less will be the desire.

Furthermore, the West in general does not distinguish between the instinct and its manifestations. It is apparent from the books and studies of the Western psychologists, who carried the perception that the sexual act itself is an instinct and not as a manifestation of the instinct of procreation.

The difference between the two perspectives is critically important because of the consequences related to what is intended, according to the respective perspectives. Whoever views the sexual act as an instinct

will make sex itself a purpose, whilst whoever views sex as a manifestation of the instinct of procreation, will focus on a purpose, other than the sexual act, defining its subject and manner accordingly. Based on this differentiation, human behavior toward sex is determined in terms of how much influence and impact it has on the life of individuals and society. There are those amongst the Westerners who do differentiate the sexual aspect into instinct and its manifestation. They say that sex serves the purpose of procreation, whilst they assert a contradiction between the objective of nature, as they call it, and the objective of the human. They defined the objective of nature as childbirth, whilst the objective of humans is to attain the greatest level of pleasure from orgasms, as mentioned in the book, *Origins of the Sexual Impulse* by Colin Wilson. This Western view is invalid because it diverts the attention of man away from the actual instinct as a whole, to just one of its manifestations. Thus, the branch is focused upon rather than the root. So, the objective of humans becomes to achieve sexual pleasure as much as possible, with no consideration regarding the continuity of the human species. This leads man to subversion and perversion in search of all forms of depravity, such as necrophilia, zoophilia, hypoxyphilia and others, that deprive man of his humanity.

As for the consequence and impact of this view about sexual relationships upon humanity in general and the Western society in particular, it is evident that it has led to many evils in the West. These include:

- Changing the reality of a woman from her original status of being a mother, housewife and honor that must be protected, into merely a sexually desirable commodity. The West does not pay attention to her humanity, but only to her sexual femininity.
- The dominance of an artificial, visual form for a woman, represented by a glamorous, sexualized body, that leads to physical and mental diseases amongst women.
- The abandoning of the concept of family and its necessity for society.
- The corruption and disintegration of family relations, failure of marriages and frequent divorce, despite falling numbers of marriages.
- The abandoning of the responsibility of fathers toward their children, whom state institutions then foster and educate. This is aligned to the concept of professionalization of parenthood, which is held as superior to natural, familial parenthood by some.
- Fornication and prostitution became so rampant that they became norms, as did the increase in abortion and the birth of children from fornication and adultery, whom the West formerly called illegitimate children.
- The spread of marital infidelity and the lack of trust between spouses.
- The spread of homosexuality, which brought with it dangerous diseases and psychological problems.

- The prevalence of rape and frequent sexual abuse of children.

- The slowing of demographic growth and the aging of Western society. This is a result of neglecting the basis of the instinct, which is the survival of the species, procreation. This is the issue that threatens the existence of the West as a whole. In his book, *The Death of the West*, conservative US politician, Patrick Joseph (Pat) Buchanan warned, "the Death of the West is not a prediction of what is going to happen, it is a depiction of what is happening now. First World nations are dying. They face a mortal crisis, not because of something happening in the Third World, but because of what is not happening at home and in the homes of the First World. Western fertility rates have been falling for decades."

In fact, the sexual desire is natural in humans and it can be either suppressed, unleashed or organized. Suppression contradicts the nature of a human's instinct that needs to be satiated. However, unleashing, within what is called sexual expression, abandoning all constraints and focusing on satiation alone, also contradicts the reality of its nature of being a manifestation of the instinct of procreation. It is wrong to neglect the root and focus on the branch. Accordingly, the view of the community - any human community - concerning that which exists between men and women in terms of the male-female relationship, (i.e. their sexual relationship), must be changed from a view focused solely on pleasure and enjoyment, to one of considering pleasure and

enjoyment a natural and necessary matter, but the view is orientated toward the purpose for which this instinct exists in origin. This alone will make the community focused on the purpose for which this instinct exists, which is the survival of the species.

Both the satiation and the purpose of the instinct can be achieved. Tranquility will inevitably be realized for a community that adopts this concept. This is the correct view that convinces the mind and agrees with human innateness (*fiṭrah*). Despite the West knowing the corruption of its view through the catastrophic consequences it unleashed on society, it refuses to acknowledge the truthfulness of the Islamic view, out of its own arrogance and stubbornness, because Islam contradicts the two concepts represented as the pillars of its civilization, i.e. freedom and individualism.

Refuting the most Important Concepts of the Western Civilization

Any civilization is a collection of concepts about life, including the foundational, fundamental concepts which its people consider as criteria, values and ideals that makes them distinct from others. This collection also includes secondary, branchial concepts. Amongst the fundamental, distinctive concepts of the Western civilization, as mentioned earlier, are the concepts of individualism and freedom (liberty). Economist and philosopher, Ludwig Von Mises, says in his book, *Liberty and Property*, "The distinctive principle of Western social philosophy is individualism. It aims at the creation of a sphere in which the individual is free to think, to choose, and to act without being restrained by the interference of the social apparatus of coercion and oppression, the State. All the spiritual and material achievements of Western civilization were the result of the operation of this idea of liberty."

Refuting the Idea of Individualism

The word individualism is derived from the word individual. Its origin is the Latin word *individuum*, which means indivisible, impossible to split into parts or inseparable part. In the West, this meaning establishes a philosophical vision based on the concept of individualism applied on an entity that is indivisible, that is, a human being with its own distinctive characteristics and has the independence of thinking, choosing and acting. It is the theory that asserts that an individual is superior to all forms of reality, with the greatest intrinsic worth. The term individualism is also used in contrast to socialism/sociability and collectivism. It provides the political vision that lends preeminence to the individual and individual initiative, reducing, or even denying, the role of the state. It also provides the societal vision that focuses on the rights of the individual, as opposed to the group, whilst making the role of the state and societal institutions subservient to the individual and ensuring his interests. The concept of individualism encapsulates the reality of the struggle of the Western man against totalitarian and despotic regimes, before Enlightenment and modernity. It symbolizes the new Western universal view, with political, economic and social dimensions, in which the individual becomes both the masters and center of the universe, controlling his own existence. Every individual has the freedom to choose his way of life and behavior, as he is the entity that precedes the entities of the state, community and society. The individual is born with natural rights which he must enjoy. Accordingly, the individual is the objective of the state, which preserves his

rights and protects his freedom (liberty). The individual is also the objective of society, where the community serves the individual, and not where the individual serves the community.

The reality of the concept of individualism is that it emanates from secularism. The concept arose when the Western man rid himself of the authority of the Church and kings, that connected all of his worldly affairs and actions to the Hereafter. Within the system, he felt coerced and oppressed, with his will and rights within life, crushed. In that era, his identity was shaped according to the traditions and beliefs of the society. When he rid himself of this authority, his connection with the Hereafter was severed. He then turned his full attention toward worldly affairs. So, he started living in this world and not outside of this world, as they say. Instead, he became the master of this world. The centrality and sovereignty of the individual was reinforced by the theory of natural rights. This theory asserts that the individual has his rights derived from his nature, whilst society does not grant him such rights. These rights are fixed for him, inalienable and cannot be repealed.

Thus, individuals are born with their natural rights i.e., their existence with their rights precedes the existence of the society, its laws, legislation and constraints. Accordingly, freedom is the foundation of human existence. Individuals are equal in these rights. None of them deprives or repeals the rights of others. Since the individual is a non-social entity in terms of origin and nature, he is subjected to quarrel, conflict and chaos in the event of socialization. So, there must be an organization in

such a situation by making concessions with a community of individuals. This community's objective is to establish the right to freedom and equality for all i.e., the individual concedes his rights to the collective will, embodied by the state through social contract. In this way, through mutual contract, the ruling authority becomes a human institution that derives its legislation from the regulatory agreement between the people. The state then regulates the rights and freedoms, i.e., the state executes upon the basis of human will and not upon the basis of divine will, where the will of individuals is the root and basis of collective will.

According to the Western thinkers, individualism is amongst the defining pillars of the Western civilization. Some Western thinkers even considered it: "the defining cultural characteristic of European civilization" (as mentioned by Ricardo Duchesne in his book: *The Uniqueness of Western Civilization*). Thus, capitalism is described as an individualistic ideology. The ideology views that society is a collection of individuals. Capitalism views society only as a secondary consideration, whilst being orientated toward individuals. Accordingly, capitalism is obliged to ensure individual freedoms. Hence, freedom of belief is within what it sanctifies. Freedom of economic ownership is also sacred and must not be restricted, according to its philosophy. The state makes restrictions only to ensure freedoms. The state executes these restrictions with the power of the army and strict laws. Nevertheless, the state is only a means to an end, not an end in itself. Sovereignty ultimately belongs to individuals and not to the state.

Capitalism is an invalid philosophy in its perception about man, society and the concept of rights. The evidences for its invalidity are many, including:

Firstly: In *Leviathan*, Thomas Hobbes defined the natural rights upon which the philosophy of individualism is built, by saying, "The right of nature, which writers commonly call jus naturale, is the liberty each man hath to use his own power as he will himself for the preservation of his own nature; that is to say, of his own life; and consequently, of doing anything which, in his own judgement and reason, he shall conceive to be the aptest means thereunto." Immanuel Kant defined the natural rights by saying: "It is only what the reason of every human being considers a priori" (as mentioned by Jacqueline Russ in her Dictionary of Philosophy.)

What they intended by this is that man is born with a specific nature. It is this nature, upon which he is born or he is found, that is his law of conduct and behavior. This means that this nature is by itself of fixed principles i.e., rights. The theory that the individual possesses natural rights or pre-political rights or pre-contractual rights, as they say assumes the precedence of these rights over the society with its systems, laws and legislation, based on the idea of the state of nature. State of nature is the virtual and imaginary state in the minds of some philosophers such as Thomas Hobbes, John Locke and others. It has no reality as it is based on speculations, assumptions and perceptions. The focus of study is not related to the first human being, whose reality is imagined in their minds. It is not related to prehistoric or pre-civilized humans either. Instead, it is related to human beings in terms of being

tangible and sensed, both as individuals or as a collective community.

So, we do not need to assume the reality of a human in order to study him and then to make a judgment about him. Instead, we must proceed from the existing reality to make analogy upon the absent, with what is witnessed. Not the other way around. The nature of humans which they discuss is what is created or found within humans. The essence of a man can be studied by looking at his actions and behaviors. When looking at the actions of a man, one can observe within him vital energy. This vital energy has natural sensations that motivate man to satiate them. This motivation creates feelings and sensations that require satiation. Amongst those feelings and sensations are those that mandate satiation. If they are not satiated, man will die because they are related to the existence of vital energy, in terms of the existence of humans. Then there are feelings and sensations that require satiation, but they do not mandate sensation. If a man does not satiate these, he will be agitated but he will remain alive. This is because they are related to the needs of the vital energy, but not the existence of the energy. Accordingly, vital energy is of two kinds: one kind that requires mandatory satiation and are called organic needs such as hunger, thirst and relieving the call of nature. The other kind requires satiation but not mandatorily and are called instincts. There are three instincts: 1) Survival instinct whose manifestations are fear, love to own, love to dominate and others that serve the survival of humans. 2) Procreation instinct, whose manifestations are sexual inclinations, motherhood, fatherhood and others that serve the continuity of the human race. 3) Sanctification instinct,

whose manifestations are the feelings of deficiency, incapability, need and reverence. It is the ultimate respect in the heart for something amongst others that motivate man to search for his essence, existence and his greatest problem represented by the crucial questions: where did I come from? Where will I go? What am I doing here?

This is the nature of humans. It is to be noted that when a man rushes to satiate his needs or instincts, he only does that based on the rational comprehension, distinguished from animals in that it is not merely an instinctive reaction. Thus, a man needs two concepts for his behavior: The concept about a thing in terms whether it satiates or does not satiate, and the concept about life in terms of whether the thing is permissible to satiate with or not. Concepts about life are not derived from the essence of things and not from the essence of humans. Instead, they are external matters connected to the viewpoint and the adopted criterion of actions. In other words, they are connected to the system emerging from the creed that defines rights and obligations for a man as an individual or community.

There are no such thing as natural rights that exist within a person from birth. This is because rights are determined by the civilizational and cultural concepts, adopted by individuals. Civilizations are distinct with regards to all that they adopt in terms of concepts and systems, whose validity is measured according to the extent of their agreement with human innateness (*fiṭrah*). For example, Medieval European civilization contradicts human nature by adopting the idea of monasticism and repression. Likewise, Modern European Civilization

contradicts human nature by encouraging licentiousness and approving homosexuality. As for the Islamic civilization, it agrees with human nature by adopting the concept of organization and satiation, without repressing it or unleashing it to excess. Islam acknowledges the instinct and its satiation, whilst also organizing the manifestation of the instinct without unleashing it.

Secondly: Since when man is known to live in a society, living in a civil state, as they say, he is not in a natural state. The reality is that he is a social being subjected to a system within society and state that defines his rights and obligations. As for the claim that man turns from the state of nature into a civil state, civilized in a civil society, through a social contract that guarantees individualized natural rights, it is invalid both theoretically and practically. As for the claim that individual's will is the basis and precursor of a community, hence individuality must be preserved by looking at society as a collection of individuals, in which the system establishes the values of individuals and not of community, this is also invalid both theoretically and practically. The reality of society is that it is a collection of people with permanent relationships. Thus, individuals can come together even in millions to form a group. It is the collection of individuals that forms a group. If there exist permanent relationships between them, then they become a society. If there are no permanent relationships, between them, then they remain a group alone. They can form a society only when there are permanent relationships between them.

What makes a group of people form a society is the existence of permanent relationships (*'alaaqaat*) between

them. These relationships emerge as a consequence of their interests because people need one another to fulfill their many, varied interests. Thus, interests are the motive for establishing relationships and if there are no interests, there will be no relationships. However, such interests are only mischiefs or benefits, in terms of their nature as being interests, by the concept of man about the interests. Since concepts are the meanings of thoughts, thoughts determine the interests. Thus, the existence of thoughts and their unification amongst people, generates their relationships.

Since there must be emotions in addition to thoughts, such as joy, pleasure, anger and others, such emotions must also be unified in harmony with interests. Yet, even both thoughts and emotions are not sufficient to generate permanent relationships. There must be a system to treat these interests, so that this relationship exists on a permanent basis. Accordingly, unification of thoughts, emotions and systems must be achieved amongst people, in order to establish relationships between them. If there is no unification of these three matters amongst them, then there will be no relationships. Thus, society is defined as consisting of people and the unification of thoughts, emotions and systems amongst them. Society is not as the capitalists claim. It is not merely a group of individuals in which each individual works to achieve his personal interest. According to them, society is a byproduct of the aggregate of the wills of individuals.

The Western view about society did not in fact change the definition of society as an evident, existing reality. Instead, it is only the function of society that has

changed amongst them, as the concept of relationships was painted with a particular hue. Individualism has been enshrined in individuals, focusing on their rights and freedoms as independent entities separate from the group. In the Western view, societal life is nothing but an issue of individual decisions and utilitarian choices, in which interdependencies and relationships are conditioned on the satisfaction of an individual interest. Thus, capitalist society is a society formed with relationships based on interest, governed by utility (benefit), thereby resulting in isolation, introversion, selfishness, indifference, lack of cooperation and dysfunctional family relationships and the loss of family values within society at large.

This in turn led to growing criticism of individualism even in the West and the emergence of calls to revive collectivism and solidarity, as values for individuals. Moreover, the Western states themselves have actually begun to interfere in many of the economic, political and social matters, restricting individualism on the pretext of creating a balance in society. It is a recognition of the existence of public interests, prioritized over private, individualistic interests, until Western state have started to resemble totalitarian regimes.

Thirdly: The philosophy of individualism perceives that an individual is in a persistent and continuous effort to preserve himself, his independence and rights to own and decide by himself, with a fear of dissolving into a collective identity imposed on him by coercion. Thus, individuals in capitalist society are separated particles or singular entities, who compete with one another. So, each separated individual is an enemy to the other in potency

and in act, which means individualism supposes the existence of conflict between individuals and community. In the Western view, man has to choose one of the two options. The first option is individualism in which he is of supreme value, allowing him to formulate his being and becoming, according to his desire and will. The second option is collectivism in which a group is of supreme value, instead of individuals, which would inevitably and automatically shape, based on the criterion, the desire and will of the community, as claimed by some ideological doctrines, such as socialism.

However, since an individual takes precedence over a community, according to the philosophy of Individualism, one is more deserving to prevail, be first in preference and be of supreme value, this only means maintaining the state of conflict in society, which continues to exist between individuals and the wider community.

Individualism did not address the issue and did not regulate it to ensure happiness and contentment for man, by being an individual as part of a community. Instead, it pits one party against another and keeps the society burning in the fires of conflict. The fact is that the relationships of an individual with the community of a society i.e., people, with the characterization of being individuals, whilst being part of a community, must be organized to ensure harmony, coherence, non-conflict and non-contradiction between desires and wills, which will lead to conflict, rupture and disintegration. So, the community must be viewed as a whole having parts, whilst the individual must be viewed as a part of this community, inseparable from the community at large. However, the

nature of an individual being a part of a community does not mean that it is a part is like a mere spoke in a wheel. Instead, it means a significant part of the whole, like a hand being a part of the body. Such is the Islamic view about society, including the relationships of individuals with a community. Accordingly, Islam takes care of this individual as a part of a community and not as an individual separate from the community, which leads to the preservation of community. At the same time, Islam takes care of the community, not as a whole without having parts, but as a whole composed of parts who are individuals, which in turn leads to the preservation of those individuals as parts. This Islamic view is the only view that ensures the establishment of peace, tranquility, affection and compassion in society. Nu'man bin Bashir reported that the Messenger of Allah (saw) said, «الْمُسْلِمُونَ كَرَجُلٍ وَاحِدٍ، إِنْ اشْتَكَى عَيْنُهُ اشْتَكَى كُلُّهُ، وَإِنْ اشْتَكَى رَأْسُهُ اشْتَكَى كُلُّهُ» **“Muslims are like one body of a person; if the eye is sore, the whole body aches, and if the head aches, the whole body aches.”** [Narrated by Muslim in his Sahih].

Refuting the Idea of Freedom

The origin of the concept liberty/ freedom for all of humankind is that it is the opposite to slavery or enslavement. This is the real meaning of the term that has been mentioned in the linguistic heritage of humankind since the term was first used. Then, over time, its connotation extended to other matters. So, the term was used to express metaphorical meanings that express the state of detachment from slavery according to languages, cultures and civilizations of nations.

In the Western dictionaries, the word liberty/ freedom comes with the meaning of opposite to slavery. Jacqueline Russ states in her Dictionary of Philosophy: " liberty ...the state of a person who is not in a state of slavery or servitude...". It has also the meaning of the absence of external constraints. Westerners have noticed in it a connotation that subserves the meaning of the absence of constraints or necessity or coercion, over choice or action. It is also used amongst Westerners with the meaning of independence and sovereignty. Thus, a free man is the one who is not subjected to external constraints or coercive force, or he is the one who follows no master.

From the linguistic usage of the word, amongst almost all of humankind, it is apparent that the consensus meaning of the word freedom is the emancipation from constraints, whether they are material or moral. Since ancient times, this concept has been associated with the specifics of civilization and culture prevalent in any

society. Despite this, the term was defined only with its opposite i.e., slavery. Its derivative or generative or modern meanings were only built by observing the meaning of emancipation, as opposed to slavery. As Aristotle states in his *Politics*, by saying, “The basis of a democratic state is liberty ... a man should live as he likes. This, they say, is the privilege of a freeman, since, on the other hand, not to live as a man likes is the mark of a slave”.

Humanity has perceived the meaning of freedom only after observing the meaning of slavery or other similar meanings attached to it such as oppression, coercion, compulsion and force, according to some of the philosophers. Western philosophers and thinkers of the Enlightenment era did not deviate from this method when they adopted the idea of freedom, with its modern intellectual and political concepts, in the eighteenth century CE. They depicted their life in the Middle Ages as the life of slaves who have no will or power. They depicted the Church, with its religious authority, and kings, with their political authorities, as masters who enslave people, usurping the people’s will to think, express, possess and enjoy life.

Thus, their struggle was for the sake of will and sovereignty. They sought liberation i.e., the emancipation from the constraints of the Church and its teachings, as well as the emancipation from the shackles of the rulers and their tyranny. So, the word freedom encapsulated all of this. Freedom became one of the pillars of the Western

civilization. Andrew Heywood states in his book, *Key Concepts in Politics and International Relations*, that, "Freedom is often considered to be the supreme political value in Western liberal societies. Its virtue is that, attached to the idea that human beings are rationally self-willed creatures, it promises the satisfaction of human interests or the realization of human potential. In short, freedom is the basis for happiness and well-being."

However, the West, in its era of Enlightenment, did not focus on absolute freedom. Instead, it focused on personal freedom in harmony with the idea of individualism, which settled upon the launching point of man in this worldly life is through isolating him from the Hereafter, as he is the master of the universe. Accordingly, freedom known to be natural liberty or personal freedom that was sought in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries CE, is distinct from the connotations of previous freedoms, such as freedom known by the Greeks. It is apparent, for example, in the writings of Hobbes, Locke, Mill, Adam Smith and Bentham. This is strongly emphasized by Benjamin Constant in his famous speech, "The Liberty of Ancients Compared with that of Moderns" of 1819, highlighting the stark difference between ancient and modern freedom.

Thus, according to the Western concept of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries CE, freedom is to lift restrictions upon an individual, by leaving his affairs to his self, to exercise his natural rights and to realize his personal interests in a way that he wishes. This can only

be possible by curbing the hegemony of the state and limiting its interference in his intellectual, economic, social and political affairs. If there have to be laws to transform man from the state of nature into the civil state, regulating his behavior in a civil society, then they must be only to the extent that they are absolutely necessary. Based on this concept, the rights of individuals were established in Western charters and constitutions, after the French Revolution, in a manner that preserves individual freedom (liberty), in a form that is closer to absolute freedom. An example of this was France's Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen of 1789 (French: Déclaration des droits de l'homme et du citoyen de 1789) which states, "Article IV – Liberty consists of doing anything which does not harm others: thus, the exercise of the natural rights of each man has only those borders which assure other members of the society the fruition of these same rights. These borders can be determined only by the law."

In fact, this concept of natural or individual freedom is like the idea of individualism. It was only a reaction to the oppression suffered by Western individuals. It was not a deep and crystallized intellectual perception that takes account of the reality of man, society and the nature of relationships between them. Man cannot live within society, without restrictions, otherwise, society would turn into a jungle, where the strong would dominate the weak. This matter was realized by the West, hence it abandoned the concept of freedom as perceived during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries CE. It coined the term negative liberty as opposed to a newly theorized positive liberty.

Andrew Heywood states in his book, *Key Concepts in Politics and International Relations*, that, “modern liberals and socialists have tended to subscribe to a positive view of freedom that justifies widening the responsibilities of the state, particularly in relation to welfare and economic management. The state is regarded as the enemy of freedom when it is viewed as an external constraint on the individual, but as a guarantee of freedom when it lays down the conditions for personal development and self-realization.” In the twentieth century CE, after the change of global political, societal and economic conditions, with the outbreak of the First World War and the success of Bolshevik Revolution in 1917, as well as the emergence of various crises, the West began to review the concept of freedom. It settled on another concept called civil liberty, which in turn includes personal, religious, economic and political freedom.

In his book, *Principles of Political Science*, Robert Niven Gilchrist states: “Civil Liberty arises from the state. The state is organised in government, which lays down laws, executes them, and, through the judiciary, interprets them in disputed cases. The powers of government are determined by the state, so that the sovereignty of the state is the guarantee of individual liberty against the government.” The meaning of this statement is that the West abandoned the idea of freedom, as conceived in the era of Enlightenment. The West began to see the necessity of imposing restrictions by the state with regulatory laws, even if they became many laws. Ramsay Muir said in his book *Nationalism and Internationalism*:

“Law in the western sense cannot exist without some degree of liberty, and Liberty cannot exist except under the protection and support of Law.”

In this way, freedom in the West became just an atmosphere - as described by Harold J Laski - which allowed individuals to exercise their actions and activities within limitations. It became a conditional or restricted freedom, limited by its connection with laws and state. "It is the ability to choose between several things, i.e., the freedom to act, to live and to behave under the direction of rational will without harming others or without any pressure other than that imposed by the necessary just laws and the duties of social life." Or as Montesquieu said in his book: *The Spirit of the Laws*: “Liberty is the right to do whatever the law allows.”

In fact, this modern Western conception of freedom is not just aversion to the old formal conception. Instead, it is in fact an aversion to freedom itself. It is completely contradicting the essence of freedom, even though the West denies that. Freedom is in fact the emancipation from constraints. Freedom can only be called such in this sense. Thus, when a slave is emancipated from his master, he is said to be free. When a land is liberated from colonialists, it is said to be free. This is the meaning that comes to every mind when the word freedom is uttered. It is the quoted meaning in the dictionaries of the West. It is also the meaning intended by the thinkers and philosophers of Europe, for which they fought during their conflict with the Church and kings.

Hence, the current stance of the West, that freedom does not mean the absence of restrictions and emancipation from them, destroys the basis upon which the Western civilization was built, erasing its history based on the myth of struggle for Western individual to do whatever he wishes, liberating himself from the shackles of law that restrained his desires and aspirations. If the current freedom in the West, called civil liberty, is defined as sovereign law, as mentioned in the books of Western political science, i.e., if freedom is subjected to law and conformity with law, then what is the difference between such freedom and the freedom of the Romans for example?

Is it not the Roman freedom as defined in *The Digest of Justinian*, in its Volume 1, Book 1, under "Human Status," which states that, "Freedom is one's natural power of doing what one pleases, save insofar as it is ruled out either by coercion or by law."? Does this mean that Roman civilization is the civilization of freedom? Does it mean that European people were already free before the outbreak of the revolution for liberty? Does it also mean that kings and Caesars used to defend freedom, by making people submit to law and fight thinkers who challenged laws? If freedom in the modern Western tradition is to mean sovereignty of law, then it means that all people of the world are free and they enjoy freedom. So, why adorn the capitalist world alone with the title of the free world? What is there to boast about when all civilizations are equal in this? Moreover, why did the

Western revolutions for Enlightenment take place in the first place?

The term freedom, within the history of its usage amongst humankind, is unachievable in the actions of the created, whatever is said about its definition. It is not possible for an individual to exist in a society without imposing restrictions upon his behavior called law, order, rules, customs, responsibility or others. It is not possible for an individual to exist in a community, whilst living in a state of emancipation from restrictions that organize relationships, unless he chooses isolation and to live alone. As such, absolute freedom exists only in the sense of an imaginary natural state.

As for the real state of man, whether it is ancient or modern, whether in the East or the West, it is the state of discipline i.e., in the state of non-freedom. Accordingly, the concept of Western freedom is not credible. It is possible to determine its semantic validity only by linking the Western thought itself to freedom, meaning that Western freedom is not defined on its own absolute terms but is qualified within a context. Indeed, it is a relative idea defined by its particular context, which is the idea of the West and its concepts or the Western ideology and its civilization. Thus, the free man in the west is the one who adopts secularism and lives according to the Western model, as limited and restricted by the barons of finance, media and sex. The delusion of freedom is known even amongst the Western man himself who is restricted by not hundreds, but thousands of laws. The hardest and

heaviest of them are the tax laws. Thus, the West has unleashed pornography as a distraction to cover the contradiction within the West, preventing people from searching for an alternative.

Since the reality of man is that he is a social being living in a community, it is impossible for him, both rationally and practically, to be liberated from the restrictions of systems, or regulatory laws, in order for him to live with others. Islam has diverted man from looking after the impossible into accepting the possible, which is servitude to Allah (swt) alone. So, the subject of study is not related to the possibility of living without restrictions, as it is not possible. Instead, it is related to who places such restrictions. Accordingly, Islam liberates man from the servitude of humans, by granting him the submission to the Sovereignty of Allah (swt). Islam raises man to the sublimity of servitude to the Creator of humans. So, servitude is only to the Creator and not to the created. Islam ensures man's submission to the Creator. Abidance and obedience to the system of the Creator are of the highest value and raises man to the highest ranks. Islam alone realizes the wisdom of why man was created. Allah (swt) says,

﴿وَمَا خَلَقْتُ الْجِنَّ وَالْإِنْسَ إِلَّا لِيَعْبُدُونِ﴾

“And I did not create the jinn and mankind except to worship Me.” [TMQ Surah Adh-Dhariyat 51:56].

The Summary and Salvation

Many Western thinkers discuss atheism and the spiritual void afflicting Western society. They lament about man having lost his humanity, transforming into a machine in an industrialized, consumerist society. They discuss the cases of depression, misery, isolation, alienation and estrangement that afflict the individual living in Western societies, where he does not find a way to but for suicide. They also discuss absurdism, nihilism, anarchism, eclecticism, racism, opportunism, neo-slavery, wars that ravage humanity, along with the destruction of values, bloody and brutal colonialism and other miseries that are prevalent around the world. They summarize all of this misery in an expression that has become common amongst Western intellectuals, which is, the crisis of humanity. The crisis of humanity they discuss, in its simplest sense, means the state of stagnation in time and place, accompanied by the feeling of failure to reach the cure and solution. This is because of the confusion in the mentality (*'aqleeyah*) and disposition (*nafseeyah*) of man that causes turmoil in his thoughts, inclinations and behaviors. So, the sense of failure dominates him, which leads to helplessness, loss, confusion and absurdism. The crisis is not resolved by studying its manifestations and results. Instead, it is to be solved by looking at the actual cause that produced it. So, what remains is to leave stubbornness behind and boldly acknowledge the truth. The reason for the crisis of humanity, which they discuss, is the cultural and civilizational failure of capitalism that dominates the world. Its culture representing its positivist, rationalist approach has failed in its understanding of man

and his nature as it views man merely as materialistic, in both his motive and objective. It has also failed to look at society and its components, focusing only on individualism and confirmed the apothegm: "*Homo homini lupus*" (A man is a wolf to another man).

As for its civilizational failure, it is apparent in its creed that denies the connection of life with what is before and what is after. It deifies man as a master of the universe and as the legislator. The failure is apparent in its liberal societal systems that fail to provide tranquility and happiness. The failure is apparent in its values that are confined to utility and materialism alone. Its values confine human behavior to animalistic, instinctive ends alone devoid of humanity, morals and spirit.

The advancement of civilized nations is not measured in terms of material progression, as scientific and technological developments, alone. Instead, it is also measured with respect to the elevation of morals, supreme values and objectives that elevate man from the realm of the animal. It is also measured with respect to systems that agree with human innateness (*fiṭrah*) by mixing the matter with the spirit in a precise balance, combining the goodness of this world and the Hereafter. Many nations that preceded the West had strength, dominance and material advancement. However, they deviated from the rulings of their Lord and were arrogant, tyrannical and oppressive upon the earth. They were twisted, spoiled and corrupted and so Allah (swt) destroyed them. Allah (swt) says,

﴿أَوَلَمْ يَسِيرُوا فِي الْأَرْضِ فَيَنْظُرُوا كَيْفَ كَانَ عَاقِبَةُ الَّذِينَ كَانُوا مِنْ قَبْلِهِمْ كَانُوا هُمْ أَشَدَّ مِنْهُمْ قُوَّةً وَءَاتَارًا فِي الْأَرْضِ فَأَخَذَهُمُ اللَّهُ بِذُنُوبِهِمْ وَمَا كَانَ لَهُمْ مِنْ اللَّهِ مِنْ وَاكِ ﴿٢١﴾﴾

“Have they not traveled through the land and observed how was the end of those who were before them? They were greater than them in strength and in impression on the land, but Allah seized them for their sins. And they had not from Allah any protector.” [TMQ Surah Ghafir 40:21].

The salvation of the Western man and the entire world lies in abandoning the creed of secularism. It lies in taking a creed that solves the greatest problem of humankind in a manner that convinces the mind and agrees with human innateness (*fitrah*), such that hearts are filled with tranquility and peace. The true creed is the one that finds for a man a correct and comprehensive thought about man, life and universe, with respect to their relationship to what is before and what is after. Based on this comprehensive thought, man is able to determine the meaning of his existence and his utmost goal (*ghaayah*) in life, thereby defining his concepts about worldly life to shape his behavior.

Enlightened thinking is the way to find this comprehensive thought for a man. This thinking is not a compromise or evasion over answering the crucial questions of man: Where did I come from? Why am I here now? Where will I go? Any reasoning person is aware that the mere existence of things which he senses have a Creator who created them. The fact with regards to the perceived things in themselves is that either they are contingent beings, or impossible beings or necessary

beings. A contingent thing in itself is a rational judgment upon something that exists but could have not existed. This judgment that some things exist contingently, is contrasted with the judgment related to the necessary and impossible existence. Accordingly, when a man's sense falls on a table, he establishes an evident, rational judgment related to the existence of the table. It is only possible to exist because its existence is connected with its maker. As for the maker of the table himself, he is necessary for the existence of the table. This is because his existence is the reason for the existence of the table. The universe, man and life are not possible to exist of themselves evidently. Their existence evidences the Necessary Being/Existent (*waajib ul wujood*) that created them. The Necessary Being/Existent is the Creator, Allah (swt).

The study then mandates finding the relationship of the Creator with the creation. Indeed, the belief of a created man in the existence of a Creator necessitates the search for the existence of the relationship of the Creator with the creation. Since man is unable to determine the nature of his relationship with the Creator, the intellect mandates that man desists from that and leaves the matter to the Creator himself. The Creator, Allah (swt), has specified how to convey His relationship to the creation. So, He (swt) sent Messengers to humankind. Amongst them are Musa (as) who was sent to his people, Isa (as) who was sent to his people and Muhammad (saw) who was sent to the whole of humankind.

To confirm the validity of the Message and Prophethood of the Messengers, intellect mandates the

establishment of decisive evidence (*burhaan*) from the Messengers, regarding their Message. This requires the Messenger to demonstrate miracles which humans are incapable of performing, within the established norm. Such were the miracles of Musa (as), Isa (as) and other Prophets (as). However, such miracles are only carried in narrated information now, that have no verifiable reality today. The only miracle which is sensed by man and remains a challenge today, is the miracle brought by Muhammad (saw) from Allah (swt), which is the Quran.

The miracle is established as true through two methods: Either by direct comprehension or by reasoning (*istidlaal*). Thus, when Musa (as) turned a stick into a swiftly moving snake, the illusionists directly comprehended that it was a miracle and not an illusion. So, they comprehended the miracle by themselves directly and were certain of the truthfulness of Musa (as). As for those other than the illusionists, they comprehended the miracle from the inability of sorcerers to bring the like of it and their submission to Musa (as). So, the method of reasoning was their way to belief. As for the matter related to Quran, one can either directly comprehend the nature of its miracle that no one can bring the like of it or he can reason the inability of all the Arabs, whether they are believers or kuffar, to bring the like of the Quran, despite the Quran challenging them to do so. Thus, the Quran is either from Arabs or from Muhammad (saw) or from Allah (swt). It is wrong to say that the Quran comes from the Arabs, because they did not attribute it to themselves. Moreover, they failed to bring the like of the Quran, despite it challenging them. It is wrong also to say that the Quran is from Muhammad (saw) because he (saw) is an

Arab and what applies to all the Arabs also applies to him (saw). Moreover, Muhammad (saw) had spoken extensively. Within his speech are the conclusively narrated (*mutawwatur*) Hadith which are entirely different from the Quran. If the Quran were really his (saw) words, he would have claimed the miracle for all of his speech and not for some of it. It is irrational for him (saw) to claim a miracle for just part of his speech, whilst not claiming for the whole. Since it is invalid to say that the Quran is from Arabs or Muhammad (saw), it is definitely from Allah (swt) and thus the miracle validates the Messengership of the one who brought it.

Accordingly, the belief in Allah (swt) and in the Message of the Muhammad (saw) i.e., belief in the Islamic creed is built on the intellect ('aql) and is dependent on it. So, the Islamic creed is the rational creed that is convincing to the mind. It is also a creed agreeing with human innateness (*fitrah*) because it acknowledges the sanctification instinct, acknowledging the need of man for the Creator, the Arranger (Al-Mudabbir). He determines the Deen/religion i.e., the system commanded by Allah (swt), the One who organizes the actions of humans, takes care of their affairs and treats all their problems. Thus, the Islamic creed is the intellectual basis and intellectual leadership that is convincing to the mind and agrees with human innateness (*fitrah*), which brings tranquility and peace. Indeed, Islam alone is the salvation for humanity, from its crisis.

The Islamic creed is both a spiritual and political creed because of the rulings emerging from it and the thoughts which are built upon it. It takes care of the affairs

of both this world and the Hereafter. The system that emerged from it is the collection of Shariah rulings to regulate man's relationship with the Creator, himself and with other humans. It is a comprehensive and complete system built upon the basis of servitude to Allah (swt) alone. So, men and women, rich and poor, adult and young and black and white are equal in this regard. Imam Ahmed reported in his Musnad from Abu Nadhra: those who heard the sermon of the Messenger of Allah (saw) during the days of Tashreeq narrated to me that he (saw) said, «يَا أَيُّهَا النَّاسُ، أَلَا إِنَّ رَبَّكُمْ وَاحِدٌ، وَإِنَّ أَبَاكُمْ وَاحِدٌ، أَلَا لَا فَضْلَ لِعَرَبِيٍّ عَلَى عَجَمِيٍّ، وَلَا لِعَجَمِيٍّ عَلَى عَرَبِيٍّ، وَلَا أَحْمَرَ عَلَى أَسْوَدٍ، وَلَا أَسْوَدَ عَلَى أَحْمَرَ، إِلَّا بِالْتَّقْوَى أَبْلَغْتُ» **“O people, your Lord is One and your father is one: an Arab has no superiority over a non-Arab nor does a non-Arab have any superiority over an Arab. The White has no superiority over the Black nor does the Black have any superiority over a White except by piety. Have I not conveyed?”**

In this system, one can see the mixing of matter with the spirit, unlike the capitalist system that separates matter from the spirit. Man and his actions are material, as he is driven by his life energy, of organic needs and instincts, to achieve their satiation. He then performs such actions based on his belief that he is a creation of the Creator and that life is connected to what is before and what is after. So, he is restricted by the Shariah of Allah (swt) and abides by His commands and prohibitions, that shape his behavior. Man realizes his connection with Allah (swt) in his life i.e. mixes the matter with the spirit, seeking to achieve the pleasure of Allah (swt), by which he achieves perpetual tranquility i.e. happiness.

The actions of a man in Islam are not absurd, valueless and aimless. Instead, they are for an aim and so he proceeds according to the commands and prohibitions of Allah i.e., he adheres to the Shariah rulings in actions for the goal he seeks and the aim (*qasd*) he achieves. So, his actions are based on the rulings that produces an intended result that he considers in his action i.e., the achievement of a certain value (*qeemah*) for an individual and community. One who scrutinizes the Shariah rulings can see that the values specified by the Shariah, that decreed the treatments for the problems of man in life, are of four types, material, spiritual, moral and humanitarian. When a Muslim man acts to achieve these values according to the Shariah rulings, as defined, determined and organized by Islam, all those values will be achieved in Islamic society to the extent necessary, which ensures the well-being and tranquility of all. Allah (swt) says,

﴿الَّذِينَ ءَامَنُوا وَتَطْمَئِنُّ قُلُوبُهُمْ بِذِكْرِ اللَّهِ أَلَا بِذِكْرِ اللَّهِ تَطْمَئِنُّ الْقُلُوبُ﴾

“Those who have believed and whose hearts are assured by the remembrance of Allah. Unquestionably, by the remembrance of Allah hearts are assured.” [TMQ Surah Ar-Ra'ad 13:38].

In conclusion, we call for the whole of humankind, including the people of the West to review what the West has become, to renounce the idea of Capitalism and the Western civilization and to take and adopt Islam instead. Indeed, Islam is the only guarantee to save humankind from the miseries in which it now lives, by driving out humanity from the depths of injustice and darkness, into the light of justice and Truth.

Completed on 11 Safar 1443 Hijri corresponding to 18/9/2021 CE